



Uniform Law Commission

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

111 N. Wabash Ave.
Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 450-6600 tel
(312) 450-6601 fax
www.uniformlaws.org

April 11, 2013

Joint Committee on Judiciary
State of Connecticut General Assembly
Room 2500
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

Chairmen Coleman and Fox, Vice Chairs Doyle and Ritter, Ranking Members Kissel and Rebimbas, and Distinguished Members:

The Uniform Law Commission writes in support of Raised Senate Bill 1162, an act concerning the Uniform Partition of Heirs' Property Act (UPHPA).

Let me begin by defining two terms:

First, a "tenancy-in-common" is a form of ownership where two or more people have an interest in an undivided parcel of real estate. This is the default form of ownership when property is passed to an owner's heirs. For example, if you own a farm and your will leaves all your property to your three children in equal shares, after your death the three children will each have a one-third interest in the entire farm as tenants-in-common.

Next, "heirs' property" is defined in Section 2 of Senate Bill 1162 as property held as a tenancy-in-common for which there is no written partition agreement, at least one cotenant acquired title from a relative, and 20% or more of the owners or interests are related. You can think of heirs' property in terms of real estate that is passed from one generation to the next. After many years of ownership by the same family, the property may have sentimental value in addition to its monetary value. Moreover, real estate is often the single most valuable asset owned by a lower-income family.

UPHPA protects the property rights of people who inherit family-owned real estate as tenants-in-common. Wealthier families may not need protection because they can use sophisticated estate planning techniques to create other forms of ownership and ensure the preservation of their land. Less wealthy families are more likely to use a simple will to pass assets to their heirs, or to die intestate. In either case, the property owner's heirs will take ownership of the real estate as tenants-in-common. As the property passes through each generation, the number of cotenants multiplies.

Here is the issue: the current law governing tenancies-in-common leaves heirs' property vulnerable to real estate speculators. An investor who acquires a share may file a partition

action and potentially acquire the entire property at a low price. An example will illustrate the problem.

Imagine a widow with three children who owns a small farm, which includes a farmhouse where she lives. Unless the widow makes other provisions in her estate plan, when she dies her three children will inherit the property as tenants-in-common. Imagine further that two of the children would like to maintain family ownership of the farm, but the third child needs cash. If his siblings cannot afford to buy his share, he might lose his one-third interest in a judgment sale or sell it to a real estate investor. Either way, the new cotenant is unrelated to the siblings and probably has no personal attachment to the land.

Under current law, the new cotenant can petition the court for a partition of the farm, and potentially purchase the heirs' interests at auction. Partitions can be done in one of two ways: a partition-in-kind in which the land is physically divided into one parcel for each cotenant based on his or her ownership percentage, or a partition-by-sale in which the farm is sold and the cotenants split the proceeds. If the property contains only one farmhouse, physically dividing it into three shares of equal value could be difficult. Therefore, a court may be more likely to order a partition-by-sale, forcing the two siblings to sell their interests in the property against their will.

Forced sales usually bring meager returns. Depending on the property location and the manner of sale, the investor may be able to buy the other siblings' interests at a price well below the fair market value. In the end, the siblings would have little to show for their inheritance.

If UPHPA becomes law, the cotenant who files for partition must first notify the other cotenants of his intent to sell his share. Unless the parties agree on the property value, the court will order an independent appraisal. Any cotenant may challenge the appraised value and the court, after a hearing, will make the final determination. The co-tenants who did not request partition will have 45 days to exercise a right of first refusal to purchase the seller's share at the court-determined value, and an additional 60 days in which to arrange financing.

If the co-tenants do not exercise their option to purchase, the court must order partition-in-kind unless the court finds, after consideration of the factors listed in Section 9 of the bill, that partition-in-kind will result in great prejudice to the owners as a group. In that case, the court may order partition-by-sale, but the property must be offered for sale on the open market for a reasonable period of time at a price no lower than the court-determined value. If the property still does not sell, the court may approve the highest offer, or may permit a sale by auction or by sealed bid.

Finally, it is important to note what Senate Bill 1162 will NOT do:

1. The bill does not repeal the current Connecticut partition statute. Senate bill 1162 applies only to heirs' property; if the real estate to be partitioned does not meet the definition of heirs' property, the current statute applies.

2. The bill does not prevent an owner of heirs' property from selling his or her share. Rather, the bill creates a right of first refusal for the other cotenants, and ensures that the seller will receive fair market value by using an independent appraisal process when the parties cannot agree on the sale price.
3. The bill will not prevent the partition of heirs' property. If the cotenants do not exercise their right to purchase the seller's share, the land may be partitioned by the court. The bill creates a preference for partition-in-kind unless great prejudice will result to the owners as a group, in which case partition by sale is permissible.

UPHPA was approved by the Uniform Law Commission in the summer of 2010 and has been enacted so far in Georgia and Nevada. The legislatures in Hawaii and South Carolina are currently considering the uniform act, and a Montana UPHPA bill is expected to be signed into law by the Governor very soon.

UPHPA has been endorsed by the ABA Section on Real Property, Trusts, and Estates; the American College of Real Estate Lawyers; the National Black Caucus of State Legislatures; the Center for Heirs' Property Preservation; the Heirs' Property Retention Coalition; the Southern Poverty Law Center; and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights. The Council of State Governments included UPHPA in its Suggested State Legislation.


In summary, enacting Senate Bill 1162 will protect the property rights of Connecticut citizens who inherit real estate. The bill does so by providing a series of reasonable court procedures designed to inform heirs of their rights and give those who wish to retain family-owned land the opportunity to do so, without unduly restricting the rights of those who wish to liquidate their investment. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the members of the Joint Committee on Judiciary vote favorably on Raised Senate Bill 1162. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Ben Orzeske

ULC Legislative Counsel



Uniform Law Commission
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

111 N. Wabash Ave.
Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 450-6600 tel
(312) 450-6601 fax
www.uniformlaws.org

**Uniform Law Commission Connecticut Delegation
Contacts for the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (UPHPA)**

David Biklen, Chair
(860) 233-4200
biklen@sbcglobal.net

Neal Ossen, Legislative Liaison
(860) 521-0289
nossen@skybridge.com

William Breetz
(860)983-3808
william.breetz@law.uconn.edu

**Uniform Law Commission Home Office Contact for
Real Property, Trust, and Estate Acts**

Benjamin Orzeske
(312) 450-6621
borzeske@uniformlaws.org

The Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (2010)

A Summary

The Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act addresses a problem faced by many middle to low-income families who own real property: dispossession of their land through a forced sale. For many of these families, real estate is their single most valuable asset. Rural African-American families have been hit especially hard. Following the the civil war, African-Americans acquired between sixteen and nineteen million acres of agricultural land by 1920. Today, African-Americans retain only about seven million acres of that land.

Most higher-income families engage in sophisticated estate planning, ensuring a smooth transfer of wealth to the next generation. In contrast, lower-income landowners are more likely to use a simple will to divide property among children, or to die intestate. Unless a property owner specifies a different form of ownership, the heirs of the owner will inherit real estate as tenants-in-common under state property statutes. A tenant-in-common may sell his or her interest without the consent of the co-tenants, making it easy for non-family members – including real estate speculators – to acquire an interest in the property.

To illustrate the problem, imagine a widow with three children who owns a small farm, including a farmhouse where she lives. Unless the widow makes other provisions in her estate plan, when she dies the three children will inherit the property as tenants-in-common. That is, the children will each own a one-third share of the undivided piece of real estate. Imagine further that two of the children would like to maintain their ownership of the farm, but the third child wants to convert his share into cash. Because his siblings cannot afford to buy him out, he sells his one-third interest to an unrelated real estate investor.

In a tenancy-in-common, any co-tenant may file an action with a court to partition the property. In resolving a partition action, the court has two main remedies available: partition-in-kind or partition-by-sale. A partition-in-kind physically divides the property into shares of equal value and gives each co-tenant full ownership of an individual share. However, if the tenants cannot agree on parcels of equal value, the court will often order a partition-by-sale, whereby the property is sold as a single parcel and the cash distributed to the co-tenants in equal shares.

Returning to our example, the investor can petition the court for a partition of the farm. If the property contains only one farmhouse, dividing it into shares of equal value would likely be difficult. Therefore, a court would likely order a partition-by-sale, forcing the two siblings to sell the property against their will. Even worse, forced sales often bring meager returns. The property could sell for a price well below market value, and the siblings would have little to show for their inheritance.

The Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (UPHPA) helps to solve the problem, while preserving a co-tenant's right to sell his or her share of property. It is important to note that the act only applies to heirs' property – one or more co-tenants must have received his or her property interest from a relative,

and there must be no written agreement governing partition. If that is the case, the act requires certain protections when a co-tenant files for a partition order:

1. The co-tenant requesting the partition must give notice to all of the other co-tenants.
2. The court must order an appraisal to determine the property's fair market value. If any co-tenant objects to the appraised value, the court must hold a hearing to consider other evidence.
3. Any co-tenant (except the co-tenant who requests partition) may buy the interest of the selling co-tenant at the court-determined fair market value. The co-tenants have 45 days to exercise their right of first refusal, and if exercised, another 60 days in which to arrange for financing. If more than one co-tenant elects to buy the selling co-tenant's share, the court will pro-rate the seller's share among the buyers according to their existing fractional ownership percentages.
4. If no co-tenant elects to purchase the selling co-tenant's share, the court must order a partition-in-kind, unless the court determines that partition-in-kind will result in great prejudice to the co-tenants as a group. UHPA specifies the factors a court must consider when determining whether partition-in-kind is appropriate.
5. If partition-in-kind is inappropriate and the court orders a partition-by-sale, the property must be offered for sale on the open market at a price no lower than the court-determined value for a reasonable period of time and in a commercially reasonable manner. If an open market sale is unsuccessful or the court determines that a sale by sealed bids or by auction would be more economically advantageous for the co-tenants as a group, the court may order a sale by one of those methods.

In summary, the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act preserves the right of a co-tenant to sell his interest in inherited real estate, while ensuring that the other co-tenants will have the necessary due process to prevent a forced sale: notice, appraisal, and right of first refusal. If the other co-tenants do not exercise their right to purchase property from the seller, the court must order a partition-in-kind if feasible, and if not, a commercially reasonable sale for fair market value.

WHY STATES SHOULD ADOPT THE UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

The “tenancy in common” is the default property ownership structure for two or more people who inherit a parcel of property. In addition, the law presumes that two or more people who acquire undivided interests in real property by conveyance or devise take ownership to the property as tenants in common and not as joint tenants unless the intention to create a joint tenancy is very clear. Such family-owned, ancestral property owned under a tenancy in common is often referred to as “heirs property.” Under the default rules, the tenancy in common structure is generally considered a risky form of ownership, and that risk is often greater for many families who own heirs property. If a cotenant conveys (whether for consideration or as gift) or devises his or her interest in tenancy-in-common property to an outside party, the acquiring party – no matter how small that cotenant’s undivided interest may be – can exercise the right any cotenant possesses to file a partition action and request the court to order the property be sold at a forced partition sale against the express wishes of the other cotenants.

At the conclusion of a partition action, courts in many states routinely order tenancy-in-common property sold under a partition by sale at public auctions using procedures for forced sales such as sales under execution which are notorious for yielding sales prices well below market value. Such sale procedures are used even though it is often claimed that the forced sale will provide an economic benefit to the tenants in common, even where cotenants have always paid their creditors in timely fashion and are not in default on any of their obligations. Overall, court-ordered forced partition sales have resulted in many families losing both their real property and a substantial amount of their wealth. In addition to the often severe economic loss upon the forced sale of their property, many families who own heirs property also lose substantial noneconomic, intrinsic value associated with the property. Noneconomic value can be substantial in cases in which the property possesses strong ancestral or historical significance for family members, has been used as shelter by some family members (including instances where no other viable housing alternatives exist), or has served for a long time as the location for a family-owned business.

Sophisticated property owners with access to trust and estate attorneys, business planners, and other professional assistance, can avoid or mitigate the harsh consequences of a forced partition sale by structuring agreements with their fellow cotenants to contract around the default rules of the tenancy in common, or by reorganizing their property ownership into an entirely different and more stable ownership structure. Low- to moderate-income heirs property owners, on the other hand, do not have access in most cases to similar professional assistance and are particularly vulnerable to predatory speculation. Most such owners are not even aware that their property is in jeopardy until a partition action is already underway because the default rules of the tenancy in common form can be counterintuitive in important ways for the typical property owner.

In 2010, the Uniform Law Commission promulgated the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act to provide a fair, common-sense solution to the risks posed to those who own heirs property. The Act does not displace existing partition law for non-heirs property and it does not prohibit a party from petitioning for a partition by sale. The Act establishes a hierarchy of remedies which are designed to protect a family’s property holdings and their real property wealth to the extent practicable for partition actions involving heirs property. Overall, the Act provides cotenants with many of the protections and rights commonly found in private agreements governing the partition of tenancy-in-common property. In particular, the Act:

- Defines heirs property affected by the Act, provides special notice provisions for partition actions involving heirs property, provides for the selection and appointment of disinterested commissioners (called referees or partitioners in some jurisdictions), appraisers, and brokers, and sets forth the associated considerations and timelines.
- Provides cotenants that do not seek partition by sale with a right to buy out those that do petition for a forced sale, granting cotenants that wish to preserve the property an ability to maintain ownership on an ongoing basis. Upon motion of a cotenant entitled to buyout another cotenant that petitioned for sale, the court also has discretion to conduct a second buyout of the interests of those other cotenants named as defendants who were served with the complaint but did not appear in the action, provided that the first buyout has been completed and that the purchase price for interests of non-appearing cotenants is based upon the court-determined value of the property. Such a second buyout could help in many cases to make partition in kind of the property more feasible and to consolidate ownership of the property to facilitate more rational management of the property over time.
- In those instances in which a buyout fails or there is still a cotenant who seeks a partition in kind (physical division of the property) after a successful buyout, the Act maintains the current, widespread statutory preference for a partition in kind as opposed to a partition by sale. In such instances, the Act requires a court to consider certain specified economic and noneconomic factors when determining whether partition in kind would result in great or manifest prejudice to the cotenants as a group thereby justifying a partition by sale. If partition in kind would result in great or manifest prejudice to the cotenants, (a) the court may order a sale if any cotenant requested partition by sale or (b) if no cotenant requested partition by sale, the court shall dismiss the partition action.
- If a partition by sale is ultimately ordered, the Act provides such a sale must be an open-market sale unless a sale by sealed bid or an auction would be economically more beneficial to the cotenants as a group. If an open-market sale is used, the property must be offered for sale by a real estate broker at a price no lower than the fair market value of the property as determined by a disinterested appraiser or for the value of the property all of the cotenants have agreed upon or the value produced by a different method of valuation the cotenants have agreed upon among themselves. The Act also provides the court with the flexibility to consider offers below the determined value of the property if the broker does not receive an offer for at least the determined value within a reasonable time.

The Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act provides an important addition to states' laws governing partition for heirs property, and provides heirs property owners with significant protections against unexpected and often devastating predatory speculation, including protections that wealthy property owners often have secured through private agreement. The Act will assist heirs property owners, particularly (but not exclusively) low- to moderate-income heirs owners, with preserving the integrity and value of property that has both economic and strong familial significance. It should be adopted in every state as soon as practicable.

UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

- Key Points -

The Uniform Law Commission promulgated the **Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (UPHPA)** in 2010. The Act does not limit or prohibit the filing of a partition action, and does not replace in any comprehensive way existing partition laws with respect to non-heirs property or property that has a binding agreement among cotenants on how to handle partition. It provides narrowly focused statutory procedures and a hierarchy of remedies for use in partition actions involving heirs property, and a systematic approach that will help protect holders of covered family-owned, ancestral property from real estate speculation and efforts to strip them of their real property and real property wealth without adequate recourse. Key highlights of the act include:

- “Heirs property” is defined as real property that is held under a tenancy in common in which there is no binding agreement among the cotenants governing partition of the property. Additionally, one or more of the cotenants must have acquired title from a relative, and either: 20% or more of the interests are held by cotenants who are relatives; 20% or more of the interests are held by an individual who acquired title from a relative; or 20% or more of the cotenants themselves are relatives.
- When an action for partition of real property is filed, the court must determine whether the property is heirs property. The act’s provisions will govern if the property is heirs property unless all of the cotenants have agreed otherwise.
- For partition actions involving heirs property, the act requires the posting of a conspicuous sign on the property in question which identifies the court where the action is pending and any common designation by which the property is known. A court may also require the name of the plaintiff and any known defendants to be published on the sign.
- Any court-appointed commissioner (or referee or partitioner in jurisdictions that use one of these terms) may not have an interest in or be a participant in the partition action.
- Under the act, the court appoints a disinterested real estate appraiser to assess the fair market value of the property unless all the cotenants agree to a different valuation method, agree on the value of the property, or the court determines that the cost of the appraisal will outweigh its evidentiary value. The act provides the procedural timeline for determining the fair market value.
- After the court determines the value of the property, the act provides all of the cotenants who did not request partition by sale with a right to buy out all of the interests of those who have done so, at a price equal to the court-determined value of the property multiplied by the fractional interest of the cotenant that is bought out. If more than one cotenant elects to purchase the interests of those proposing sale, the interests for sale are apportioned among the electing cotenants based upon their relative interests in the property. Upon motion of a cotenant entitled to buyout another cotenant that petitioned for sale, the court also has discretion to conduct a second buyout of the interests of cotenants named as defendants who were served with the complaint but who did not appear in the action, provided that the first buyout has been completed and that the purchase price for interests

of non-appearing cotenants is based upon the court-determined value of the property. In many circumstances, this second buyout process can help to make partition in kind of the property more feasible and to consolidate ownership of the property to facilitate its long term management.

- If all of the interests of those seeking partition by sale are not purchased by other cotenants, or if there is a cotenant remaining who seeks partition in kind after the court has concluded the operation of the act's buyout provisions, then the court shall proceed with a partition in kind unless great or manifest prejudice to the cotenants as a group would result. The act provides a list of economic and noneconomic factors which a court shall consider in determining whether great or manifest prejudice would occur if partition in kind were ordered.
- If the court does not order partition in kind, it shall order partition by sale unless none of the cotenants have requested partition by sale, in which case the court shall dismiss the action.
- A partition by sale, if ordered, must be an open-market sale unless a sale by sealed bid or an auction would be economically more advantageous and of greater benefit to the cotenants as a group. The parties may agree on a broker or a licensed one may be appointed by the court. The broker shall offer the property for sale in a commercially reasonable manner and shall list the property for sale at the court-determined value. If an offer at or above the court-determined value is received within a reasonable time, the broker may complete the sale according to state law after complying with the act's reporting requirements. If no offer at or above the court-determined value is received within a reasonable time, the court may hold a hearing to approve the highest outstanding offer, redetermine the value of the property and order the property to be continued to be offered for sale for some additional time, or order a sale by sealed bid or auction. The court determines the terms and conditions of such an alternative sale.

For questions on the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property, please contact Kieran Marion or Katie Robinson at 312-450-6600.

PRESIDENT
Kevin L. Shepherd
750 East Pratt St., Suite 900
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 244-7772

PRESIDENT-ELECT
Linda A. Striefsky
3900 Key Center
127 Public Square
Cleveland, OH 44114-1216
(216) 566-5733

VICE-PRESIDENT
Ann M. Saegert
2323 Victory Avenue
Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219-7673
(214) 651-5594

SECRETARY
Jonathan R. Shils
1170 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 2100
Atlanta, GA 30309-7649
(404) 443-5706

TREASURER
Earl L. Segal
1152 15th St., NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 292-0105

**IMMEDIATE
PAST PRESIDENT**
Philip D. Weller
1717 Main Street, Suite 4600
Dallas, TX 75201-4629
(214) 743-4502

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Ann P. Cargile (2010)
Nashville, TN

Angela M. Christy (2012)
Minneapolis, MN

Rod Clement (2012)
Jackson, MS

Dianne S. Coscarelli (2011)
Cleveland, OH

Jack Fersko (2010)
Westfield, NJ

Michael D. Goodwin (2010)
Washington, DC

David S. Gordon (2010)
Woodbridge, NJ

Raymond S. Iwamoto (2012)
Honolulu, HI

Kenneth M. Jacobson (2011)
Chicago, IL

Thomas F. Kaufman (2011)
Washington, DC

Marilyn C. Maloney (2010)
Houston, TX

Jo Anne P. Stubblefield (2012)
Atlanta, GA

Gordon W. Tanner (2011)
Seattle, WA

Ira J. Waldman (2011)
Los Angeles, CA

Roger D. Winston (2012)
Bethesda, MD

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Jill H. Pace



October 27, 2010

National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
Attention: Robert A. Stein, President
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, Illinois 60602


Re: **Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act**

Dear Bob:

I am pleased to inform you that the Board of Governors of the American College of Real Estate Lawyers voted unanimously at its meeting on October 7, 2010 to endorse the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act for enactment by the States of the United States. We encourage the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in its efforts to secure such enactments. Please note that our delegates to the Joint Editorial Board for Uniform Real Property Acts ("JEBURPA"), Ira Waldman and Ann Burkhardt, are available through the JEBURPA to assist in the enactment process.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments on this matter.

Very truly yours,



Kevin L. Shepherd
President

cc: Ira Waldman (via e-mail)
Ann M. Burkhardt (via e-mail)
Board of Governors (via e-mail)

American College of Real Estate Lawyers
11300 Rockville Pike • Suite 903
Rockville, Maryland 20852
Telephone (301) 816-9811 • Fax (301) 816-9786 • Internet www.acrel.org

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

16 CHARLOTTE STREET
CHARLESTON, SC 29403

PO DRAWER 22247
CHARLESTON, SC 29413-2247

PHONE: 843.727.2200
FAX: 843.727.2238

WWW.P-TW.COM

RECEIVED
JAN 10 2011

BY:

January 5, 2011

E. DOUGLAS PRATT-THOMAS
G. TRENHOLM WALKER
W. ANDREW GOWDER, JR.
JON L. AUSTEN
LINDSAY K. SMITH-YANCEY ISC, NCJ
CLAYTON B. McCULLOUGH
THOMAS H. HESSE ISC, CAJ
IAN W. FREEMAN ISC, CAJ
FRANCIS M. ERVIN II ISC, MAJ
DANIEL S. McQUEENEY, JR.
JAMIE A. KHAN
KATHLEEN FOWLER MONOC

National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
Attention: Robert A. Stein, President
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Re: Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act

Dear Bob:

I am pleased to inform you that the Council of the State and Local Government Section voted unanimously at its meeting on October 2, 2010 in Providence, Rhode Island, to endorse the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act for enactment by the States of the United States. We encourage NCCUSL in its efforts to secure such enactments. Our delegates to the ABA House of Delegates and others in our section who have been involved in consideration of this Act would be pleased to assist in the enactment process.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,



W. Andrew Gowder, Jr.
Secretary, State and Local Government

WAG:cas

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

**Section of Real Property,
Trust & Estate Law**

321 North Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654-7598
FAX: (312) 988-5262
<http://www.abanet.org/rpte>
E-mail: rpte@abanet.org

RECEIVED
JAN 26 2011

January 5, 2011

BY:

Mr. Robert A. Stein
President
National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Re: Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act

Dear Bob:


I am pleased to inform you that the Council of the ABA Section of Real Property, Trust and Estate Law voted unanimously at its meeting on May 8, 2010, to endorse the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act for enactment by the States of the United States. We encourage NCCUSL in its efforts to secure such enactments. Our delegates to the ABA House of Delegates and others in our section who have been involved in consideration of this Act would be pleased to assist in the enactment process.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Alan F. Rothschild, Jr.
Section Chair

CHAIR
Alan F. Rothschild, Jr.
PO Box 2707
Columbus, GA 31902-2707
CHAIR-ELECT
Andrew F. Palmieri
1909 K St. NW, #19
Washington, DC 20006-1152
TRUST AND ESTATE DIVISION
VICE-CHAIR
Tina Portuondo
1311 Miller Dr, Rm C-423
Coral Gables, FL 33146-2300
REAL PROPERTY DIVISION
VICE-CHAIR
Susan G. Talley
546 Carondelet St
New Orleans, LA 70130-3588
FINANCE AND CORPORATE
SPONSORSHIP OFFICER
Jo Ann Engelhardt
222 Royal Palm Way
Palm Beach, FL 33480-4394
SECRETARY
David J. Dietrich
PO Box 7054
Billings, MT 59103-7054
LAST RETIRING CHAIR
Roger D. Winston
4800 Montgomery Ln, 7th Fl
Bethesda, MD 20814-3462
SECTION DELEGATES TO
HOUSE OF DELEGATES
David M. English
203 Hulton Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-4300
Kevin L. Shepherd
750 E Pratt St, Ste 900
Baltimore, MD 21202-3157
David K. Y. Tang
925 4th Ave, Ste 2900
Seattle, WA 98104-1158
ABA BOARD OF
GOVERNORS LIAISON
Howard H. Vogel
PO Box 217
Knoxville, TN 37901-0217
COUNCIL
Katherine N. Barr
Birmingham, AL
Marc S. Bekerman
Woodbury, NY
Edward T. Brading
Johnson City, TN
Dominic J. Campisi
San Francisco, CA
Terrence M. Franklin
Los Angeles, CA
Susan M. Cary
Eugene, OR
Jennifer Diveterano Gayle*
King Of Prussia, PA
Michael J. Glazerman
Wellesley Hills, MA
Steven B. Govin
Saint Louis, MO
Dennis M. Horn
Washington, DC
Robert J. Krapf
Wilmington, DE
Carol G. Kroch
Wilmington, DE
Elizabeth C. Lee
Washington, DC
Orlando Lucero
Albuquerque, NM
Edward M. Maniagault
Atlanta, GA
Jo-Ann Marzullo
Boston, MA
Richard W. Nenno
Wilmington, DE
Robert C. Paul
New York, NY
Sandra G. Fowler
Tampa, FL
Susan Porter
New York, NY
Stephen R. Romline
Norfolk, VA
Barbara A. Sloan
New York, NY
Mary Margaret Sullivan*
Cincinnati, OH
Ira J. Waldman
Los Angeles, CA
Aen Walker Webster
Washington, DC
Kenneth C. Wright
Orlando, FL
YOUNG LAWYERS DIVISION LIAISON*
SECTION DIRECTOR
Robin K. Roy
(312) 988-5670
MARKETING, COMMUNICATIONS AND
MEMBERSHIP DIRECTOR
Cynthia Dickmann
(312) 988-5540
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
Antonette N. Smith
(312) 988-5263
MEETINGS AND CLE MANAGER
Lillian Swanson
(312) 988-5590
TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST
Adam Bielawski
(312) 988-5581
MEMBERSHIP AND
MARKETING MANAGER
Hillary Clark
(312) 988-5683
COMMITTEE COORDINATOR
Bunny R. Lee
(312) 988-5651



**REAL | TRUST &
PROPERTY | ESTATE LAW**

Your Source for Success



... a legacy, a history, a promise

Celebrating Five Years

January 28, 2011

John Sebert, Executive Director, Uniform Law Commission
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602

RE: Uniform Partition of Heirs' Property Act

Mr. Sebert:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Center for Heirs' Property Preservation (CHPP) in support of the Uniform Partition of Heirs' Property Act, which helps to protect the interests and needs of the most vulnerable landowners. My organization, CHPP, has provided educational services, as well as direct legal services, to heirs' property families since 2005.


Heirs' property is the term generally used to describe African American property acquired during Reconstruction in the South. Although the issue is not exclusive to the South, its prevalence along the southern coast has affected many African American families in a negative way. Typically, the original owner dies without a will. As a result, the property is usually passed down multiple generations by way of intestate inheritance, rather than the formal probate process. This scenario leads to the land being owned by multiple family members (heirs) who each own a fractional interest as tenants in common. As years go by, and more of the heirs die, this fractioned ownership pool grows making the land more vulnerable to loss. Heirs' property families can lose their land to a forced partition sale even where a majority of the heirs want to retain the land. In these instances, heirs who have lived on the property for decades can be forced to sell and relocate. These problems occur in part because most partition statutes do not give local judges the latitude to consider non-economic factors. The importance of heirs' property extends well beyond its monetary value. It is usually the only asset owned by the family and is a source of heritage, pride, security, and family identity. These factors, and the historical significance of the property, are generally not relevant in the context of a forced partition sale. Additionally, most partition statutes do not require the property be sold at fair market value nor do they provide a legal mechanism whereby family members can resist a partition sale and save the family land. As a result, heirs' property is extremely vulnerable to land speculation and predatory developers that seek to dispossess heirs who have owned the property for generations.

The Uniform Partition of Heirs' Property Act ("Uniform Act") addresses these concerns while retaining flexibility for those heirs who wish to sell their interest in the land. The Uniform Act only authorizes a forced sale if the partition-in-kind would cause great or manifest prejudice to the "cotenants as a

group." Under the Uniform Act, the Judge would be allowed to consider all relevant factors, such as length of ownership and non-economic uses of the property, when determining whether "manifest prejudice" exists. The Uniform Act also provides the defending heirs the right to buy out the interest of the co-owner requesting a partition sale. Finally, the Uniform Act establishes a preference for an open market partition sale process, utilizing a realtor instead of an auction on the courthouse steps, unless a sale by sealed bids or auction would be "economically advantageous and in the best interests of the cotenants as a group." Such a preference would greatly increase the likelihood that heirs who are forcibly dispossessed receive the maximum economic benefit.


The Uniform Act, and the adoption thereof, would establish a more equitable regime for all heirs' property owners. It offers more protection than most current state statutes and retains the flexibility to allow heirs to sell their property under advantageous circumstances. I encourage you to strongly support the Uniform Act and advocate for its adoption.

Sincerely,



Jennie Stephens
Executive Director

family - land - legacy - wealth



HEIRS' PROPERTY

Retention Coalition

<http://www.southerncoalition.org/hprc>

(334) 956-8308 [voice]

(334) 956- 8481 [facsimile]

TO: John Sebert, Executive Director, Uniform Law Commission
FROM: John Pollock, Heirs' Property Retention Coalition
RE: Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act

Mr. Sebert:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Heirs' Property Retention Coalition (HPRC) in support of the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act, which helps to protect the interests and needs of the most vulnerable landowners. HPRC was formed in 2006 to address the needs of low-income and African-American heirs' property owners, and was heavily involved in the drafting process of the Act.

Extremely common amongst African Americans and in low-income communities, heirs property is typically owned by a family for generations upon generations, is the only asset owned by the family, and often has historical, ancestral, or other significant noneconomic value in addition to its financial value. And oftentimes one or more of the family members has their homestead on the property. Unfortunately, such land is also frequently auctioned off in a partition sale against the wishes of most of the family members that own the property and through no fault of their own. These problems occur in part because the partition statutes do not require the courts to consider the non-economic value of land, do not require property sold at auction to be sold at fair market value, and do not generally provide any mechanism for family members to resist the partition sale to protect their family land. As a result, developers, land speculators, and others are able to take advantage of the ease of partition sales to dispossess these family members and purchase the property for a fraction of its price, and the indigent landowners typically lack the resources to either hire an attorney or attempt to buy the property at the auction.

The Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act ("Uniform Act") addresses these serious concerns while retaining flexibility for those wishing to sell their interest in the land. Most notably, the

HPRC members: African American Land Trust (MD) • Alabama Appleseed Center for Law & Justice • Black Family Land Trust (NC) • Arkansas Land and Farm Development Corporation • Black Farmers and Agriculturalists Association (NC) • Center for Heirs' Property Preservation (SC) • Center for Minority Land and Community Security (AL) • Concerned Citizens of Tillery (NC) • Conservation Trust for North Carolina • Federation of Southern Cooperatives Land Assistance Fund (GA) • Georgia Appleseed • Land Loss Prevention Project (NC) • Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights (D.C.) • Legal Services Alabama • National Bar Association • South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center • Southern Coalition for Social Justice (NC) • UNC Center for Civil Rights

HPRC partners: Duke University Community Enterprise Clinic • Gateway Development (SC) • Land Rich (WI) • Self-Help (NC)

Uniform Act only authorizes a forced sale if a division of the property would cause great or manifest prejudice to “the cotenants as a group”. In judging whether “manifest prejudice” exists, the Uniform Act considers all relevant factors, such as length of ownership and non-economic uses of the property, instead of focusing exclusively on economic factors. The Uniform Act also provides the defending co-owners the right to buy out the interest of the co-owner requesting a partition sale within 45 days of the action’s initiation, thus meeting the needs of both the co-owner seeking the sale of his interest and those wishing to not be dispossessed. Finally, the Uniform Act establishes a preference for an open market partition sale process (instead of an auction on the courthouse steps) utilizing a realtor who seeks fair market value, unless a sale by sealed bids or auction would be “economically advantageous and in the best interests of the cotenants as a group.” This preference increases the likelihood that land sells at market value and family members realize the maximum economic benefit in the event that they are to be forcibly dispossessed.

The Uniform Act establishes a more equitable statutory regime for all heirs property co-owners, allowing families to hold onto their land yet also sell their land under the best of circumstances. I encourage you to strongly support the Uniform Act.

Regards,

John Pollock
Facilitator, Heirs’ Property Retention Coalition

HPRC members: African American Land Trust (MD) • Alabama Appleseed Center for Law & Justice • Black Family Land Trust (NC) • Arkansas Land and Farm Development Corporation • Black Farmers and Agriculturalists Association (NC) • Center for Heirs' Property Preservation (SC) • Center for Minority Land and Community Security (AL) • Concerned Citizens of Tillery (NC) • Conservation Trust for North Carolina • Federation of Southern Cooperatives Land Assistance Fund (GA) • Georgia Appleseed • Land Loss Prevention Project (NC) • Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights (D.C.) • Legal Services Alabama • National Bar Association • South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center • Southern Coalition for Social Justice (NC) • UNC Center for Civil Rights

HPRC partners: Duke University Community Enterprise Clinic • Gateway Development (SC) • Land Rich (WI) • Self-Help (NC)



TO: John Sebert, Executive Director,
Uniform Law Commission
RE: Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act

Mr. Sebert:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Heirs' Property Retention Coalition (HPRC) in support of the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act, which helps to protect the interests and needs of the most vulnerable landowners. HPRC was formed in 2006 to address the needs of low-income and African-American heirs' property owners, and was heavily involved in the drafting process of the Act.

Without going into the specific details of the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act, which are explained more fully by my colleagues at HPRC, I do want to say that this topic is extremely important to the work we do at Tuskegee University. Since the founding of this university by Booker T. Washington in 1881, land ownership has been one of the cornerstone activities of its outreach and research units.

More recently, we have worked with African American and other minority landowners to protect their land assets through our Center for Minority and Community Security (1990) as well as through our Outreach and Assistance for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program (1994). And we are continually supplying our outreach colleagues with research-based information so that they can assist our clients in the most efficient and effective manner.


Our work has allowed African American farmers access to millions of dollars in loans for farm ownership, farm operating, and homes; and this success is tied directly to their ownership of family land, often heirs property. This is relevant for the economic well-being of not only the individuals involved but also for entire communities.

In conclusion, the Uniform Act is a major step to protect the rights of those who own this most important asset. It establishes a more equitable statutory regime for all heirs property co-owners, allowing families to hold onto their land yet also sell their land under the best of circumstances. I encourage you to strongly support the Uniform Act.

Sincerely,

Robert Zabawa, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Social Science and Rural Development Research
Director, Outreach and Assistance for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers
Director, Center for Minority Land and Community Security

100 Campbell Hall
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, Alabama 36088
zabawar@tuskegee.edu
334.727.8114
334.724-4451 fax
www.tuskegee.edu



LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS
UNDER LAW

1401 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005-2124

Tel: 202.662.8600
Fax: 202.783.0857
www.lawyerscommittee.org

January 28, 2011

John Sebert, Executive Director
Uniform Law Commission
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602

Co-Chairs

Bradley S. Phillips
Bettina B. Plevan

Secretary

Eleanor H. Smith

Treasurer

Andrew W. Kentz

Counsel

Hamilton P. "Phil" Fox, III

Executive Director

Barbara R. Arnwine

Regional Vice-Chairs

Midwest Region

Jack Block
Teresa J. Kimker

Northeastern Region

Gregory P. Hansel
Neil V. McKittrick

Mid-Atlantic Region

John McKeever
John Nonna

Southeastern Region

Valerie Shea
Harold L. Franklin

Western Region

Paul F. Eckstein
Amos Harrison
Gregory P. Landis

Chesapeake Region

Michael H. Chanin
James P. Joseph

RE: Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act

Dear Mr. Sebert,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law ("Lawyers' Committee") in support of the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (the "Act"), which helps to protect the interests and needs of the most vulnerable landowners.

The Lawyers' Committee, a nonprofit, nonpartisan legal organization, was founded in 1963 at the request of President John F. Kennedy to involve the private bar in providing legal services to address all forms of racial discrimination. In support of that purpose, the Lawyers' Committee's Community Development Project ("CDP") provides pro bono legal assistance to community organizations engaged in innovative strategies to combat land loss in minority and low-income communities, especially in cases of heirs' property. Through its Heirs' Property Initiative, CDP has partnered with local organizations in several regions to engage volunteer lawyers on heirs' property cases and policy matters, as well as held multiple workshops in communities where heirs' property families remain at risk.

Between the close of the Civil War and 1920, African Americans obtained nearly 20 million acres of land in the United States – a heroic achievement in a society largely hostile to African American property ownership. Tragically, African American families have lost the vast majority of land they acquired over the last century and, in the absence of sound legal guidance, ownership of land has become increasingly divided with the passing of each generation. The causes are numerous, but all relate in one way or another to inadequate statutes and lack of legal counsel for African American landowners. Meanwhile, the opportunity to impart this important legacy of land ownership to future generations has been greatly diminished.

Today, this problem of heirs' property afflicts thousands of African American families and communities and is a major cause of land loss and blight. Owners of heirs'



LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS
U N D E R L A W

property find themselves strapped with “dead capital” and do not have access to the benefits of land ownership that other property owners take for granted: the ability to obtain a mortgage or credit, to purchase certain forms of insurance, to access governmental assistance related to property ownership, and even to sell property.

Without going into the specific provisions of the Act, which are explained more fully by our colleagues at the Heirs' Property Retention Coalition (HPRC), the Lawyers' Committee emphasizes that the Act is a major step towards rectifying many of the injustices in the current statutory regime and helping African American families not only to keep their ancestral lands, but to place those lands back into productive use. The Act serves as a model for partition statute reform nationwide and aims to usher in a changed legal climate in which owners of heirs' property are able to more effectively retain or sell their family lands under the best of circumstances. On behalf of the Lawyers' Committee, I encourage you to strongly support the Act and its adoption.

Sincerely,

Barbara R. Arnwine
Executive Director
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

October 5, 2011

Mr. John Sebert
Executive Director
Uniform Law Commission
111 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602

Re: Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act

Dear Mr. Sebert:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) to urge you to prioritize legislative passage of NCCUSL's Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act, a uniform law that helps to protect the interests and needs of vulnerable heirs' property landowners.

In 2006, SPLC was involved in the ABA's development of a proposal to the ULC for this uniform act, and SPLC has provided both research support for the proposal and financial support for the Observers to travel to and participate in the drafting sessions.

A critical portion of SPLC's mission since 1971 has been "seeking justice for the most vulnerable members of society," particularly in the southern United States. Indigent landowners in partition sales actions typically cannot afford representation (whereas the petitioner nearly always has counsel), and frequently have no assets other than the land itself, heightening the need for procedural protections so as to ensure that the proceedings are equitable and justice is done.

Our research reveals that a) indigent landowners in the South are dispossessed of property in partition sales at a particularly high rate, owing to the greater overall rate of heirs' property; and b) current statutory law and jurisprudence frequently favors the interests of those desiring to sell over those that seek to maintain their ancestral connection to the land. The uniform act, with its multifaceted approach to providing more balanced partition sales proceedings, has the potential to stem the tide of lost heirship property, particularly in rural and minority communities across the South.

We encourage you to strongly support the Uniform Act and advocate for its adoption.

Sincerely,



Morris Dees
Founder

LAW, JUSTICE, AND ETHICS

Resolution LJE-13-39

URGING FAIR AND EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF INHERITED PROPERTY

WHEREAS, the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL) supports real estate ownership as a means of wealth creation;

WHEREAS, property ownership is an important factor in transmitting generational wealth;

WHEREAS, African Americans owned at least 16 million acres of agricultural land in the United States in 1910, yet only retain ownership of 3,826,403 acres of that land out of a total of 922,095,840 as of 2007;

WHEREAS, state property laws mandate that property inherited by multiple persons be held as a tenancy-in-common, an inherently unstable form of ownership subject to partition at the request of any one co-tenant;

WHEREAS, partition sales are a leading cause of African-American land loss;

WHEREAS, the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (UPHPA) drafted by the Uniform Law Commission was approved by that body in 2010 and recommended for enactment by the states;

WHEREAS, the UPHPA is also supported by the Council of State Governments, the American College of Real Estate Lawyers, and the American Bar Association, and Georgia and Nevada have both enacted UPHPA; and

WHEREAS, the UPHPA helps to prevent the forced sale of inherited property by ensuring due process while preserving the right of a co-tenant to sell real property for its fair market value.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL) encourages state legislatures to provide the owners of inherited property the necessary protections from a forced partition and consequent loss of family wealth;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the NBCSL urges states to examine legislation with the following components:

- ▶ The co-tenant requesting the partition must give notice to all of the other co-tenants;
- ▶ The court must order an appraisal to determine the property's fair market value, and if any co-tenant objects to the appraised value, the court must hold a hearing to consider other evidence;
- ▶ Any co-tenant (except the co-tenant who requests partition) may purchase the interest of the selling co-tenant at the court-determined fair market value with ample time to evaluate the offer and obtain financing;
- ▶ Allows more than one co-tenant to elect to purchase the selling co-tenant's share with the court able to pro-rate the seller's share;
- ▶ If no co-tenant elects to purchase the selling co-tenant's share, the court must order a partition-in-kind, unless the court determines that partition-in-kind will result in great prejudice to the co-tenants as a group; and
- ▶ If partition-in-kind is inappropriate and the court orders a partition-by-sale, the property must be offered for sale on the open market at a price no lower than the court-determined value for a reasonable period of time and in a commercially reasonable manner, and if an open market sale is unsuccessful or the court determines that a sale by sealed bids or by auction would be more economically advantageous for the co-tenants as a group, the court may order a sale by one of those methods;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the NBCSL further urges legislators to educate their constituents about planning in order to prevent or mitigate probate challenges; and

LAW, JUSTICE, AND ETHICS

Resolution LJE-13-39

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, and other federal and state government officials as appropriate.

SPONSOR(S): Representative Ken Dunkin (IL) and Representative Charlie Brown (IN)
Committee of Jurisdiction: Law, Justice, and Ethics Policy Committee
Certified by Committee Chair: Representative Gilda Cobb-Hunter (SC)
Ratified in Plenary Session: Ratification Date is December 7, 2012
Ratification is certified by: Representative Barbara W. Ballard (KS), President

UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

Drafted by the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

and by it

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED FOR ENACTMENT
IN ALL THE STATES

at its

ANNUAL CONFERENCE
MEETING IN ITS ONE-HUNDRED-AND-NINETEENTH YEAR
IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JULY 9-16, 2010

WITH PREFATORY NOTE AND COMMENTS

COPYRIGHT © 2010

By

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

October 19, 2010

ABOUT ULC

The **Uniform Law Commission** (ULC), also known as National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL), now in its 119th year, provides states with non-partisan, well-conceived and well-drafted legislation that brings clarity and stability to critical areas of state statutory law.

ULC members must be lawyers, qualified to practice law. They are practicing lawyers, judges, legislators and legislative staff and law professors, who have been appointed by state governments as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands to research, draft and promote enactment of uniform state laws in areas of state law where uniformity is desirable and practical.

- ULC strengthens the federal system by providing rules and procedures that are consistent from state to state but that also reflect the diverse experience of the states.
- ULC statutes are representative of state experience, because the organization is made up of representatives from each state, appointed by state government.
- ULC keeps state law up-to-date by addressing important and timely legal issues.
- ULC's efforts reduce the need for individuals and businesses to deal with different laws as they move and do business in different states.
- ULC's work facilitates economic development and provides a legal platform for foreign entities to deal with U.S. citizens and businesses.
- Uniform Law Commissioners donate thousands of hours of their time and legal and drafting expertise every year as a public service, and receive no salary or compensation for their work.
- ULC's deliberative and uniquely open drafting process draws on the expertise of commissioners, but also utilizes input from legal experts, and advisors and observers representing the views of other legal organizations or interests that will be subject to the proposed laws.
- ULC is a state-supported organization that represents true value for the states, providing services that most states could not otherwise afford or duplicate.

DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON A UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

The Committee appointed by and representing the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in drafting this Act consists of the following individuals:

ROBERT L. MCCURLEY, P.O. Box 861425, Tuscaloosa, AL 35486, *Chair*
WILLIAM R. BREETZ, Connecticut Urban Legal Initiative, University of Connecticut School of Law, Knight Hall, Room 202, 35 Elizabeth St., Hartford, CT 06105
GEORGE H. BUXTON, 31 E. Tennessee Ave., Oak Ridge, TN 37830
ELLEN DYKE, 2125 Cabots Point Dr., Reston, VA 20191
LANI L EWART, 1099 Alakea St., Suite 1800, Honolulu, HI 96813
PETER F. LANGROCK, P.O. Drawer 351, Middlebury, VT 05753-0351
CARL H. LISMAN, 84 Pine St., P.O. Box 728, Burlington, VT 05402
MARIAN P. OPALA, Supreme Court of Oklahoma, State Capitol, Room 238, 2300 N. Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73105
RODNEY W. SATTERWHITE, Midland County Courthouse, 441 1st District Court, 500 N. Loraine St., Suite 901, Midland, TX 79701
NATHANIEL STERLING, 4180 Oak Hill Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
M. GAY TAYLOR-JONES, 18 N. Foxhill Rd., North Salt Lake, UT 84054
THOMAS W. MITCHELL, University of Wisconsin Law School, 975 Bascom Mall, Madison, WI 53706, *Reporter*

EX OFFICIO

ROBERT A. STEIN, University of Minnesota Law School, 229 19th Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55455, *President*
BARRY C. HAWKINS, 300 Atlantic St., Stamford, CT 06901, *Division Chair*

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISOR

PHYLISS CRAIG-TAYLOR, Charlotte School of Law, 2145 Suttle Ave., Charlotte, NC 28204, *ABA Advisor*
STEVEN J. EAGLE, George Mason University School of Law, 3301 Fairfax Dr., Arlington, VA 22201-4426, *ABA Section Advisor*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JOHN A. SEBERT, 111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010, Chicago, IL 60602, *Executive Director*

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010
Chicago, Illinois 60602
312/450-6600
www.nccusl.org

UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE.....	1
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.....	9
SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.....	9
SECTION 3. APPLICABILITY; RELATION TO OTHER LAW.....	12
SECTION 4. SERVICE; NOTICE BY POSTING.....	12
SECTION 5. [COMMISSIONERS].....	13
SECTION 6. DETERMINATION OF VALUE.....	13
SECTION 7. COTENANT BUYOUT.....	15
SECTION 8. PARTITION ALTERNATIVES.....	23
SECTION 9. CONSIDERATIONS FOR PARTITION IN KIND.....	25
SECTION 10. OPEN-MARKET SALE, SEALED BIDS, OR AUCTION.....	27
SECTION 11. REPORT OF OPEN-MARKET SALE.....	29
SECTION 12. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.....	29
SECTION 13. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT.....	29
SECTION 14. EFFECTIVE DATE.....	30

UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

PREFATORY NOTE

Introduction and Summary

The Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act is an act of limited scope which addresses a widespread, well-documented problem faced by many low to middle-income families across the country who have been dispossessed of their real property and much of their real property-related wealth over the past several decades as a result of court-ordered partition sales of tenancy-in-common properties. The highly unstable ownership these families experience stands in sharp contrast to the secure property rights wealthier families typically enjoy. Further, the loss of real property-related wealth these low to middle-income families have experienced has been particularly devastating to these families given the fact that real property constitutes by far the single greatest asset that these property owners typically own, unlike the much more diversified asset portfolios that wealthier families normally possess. In addition, the Act may be very helpful to a surprising number of wealthier families who own tenancy-in-common property under the default rules and who also experience great problems with this ownership form.

The law has made the tenancy in common, a common ownership structure under which two or more cotenants own undivided interests in particular property, the default ownership structure for two or more family members who inherit real property. In addition, the law presumes that two or more people who acquire undivided interests in real property by conveyance or devise take ownership to the property as tenants in common and not as joint tenants unless the intention to create a joint tenancy is very clear. But certain key features of tenancy-in-common ownership under the default rules create serious problems for those who seek to maintain ownership of their property for themselves and their relatives, or at least the wealth represented by such real estate holdings.

- Any tenant in common may sell his or her interest or convey it by gift during his or her lifetime without the consent of his or her fellow cotenants, making it easy for non-family members – including real estate speculators in a number of instances – to acquire interests in family real property. At a tenant in common's death, his or her interest in the tenancy in common property may be transferred under a will, or if the will is not probated in time or if there is no will, under the laws of intestacy.
- A significant feature of tenancy-in-common ownership – a feature that this Act does not disturb – is the universal right of any cotenant to file a lawsuit petitioning a court to partition the property, even if that cotenant only recently acquired its interest in property that the other cotenants had owned within their family for a long time and even if that interest is very small (e.g., a five percent or even smaller interest).
- In resolving a partition action, the two principal remedies that a court may order are partition in kind of the property into separate subparcels, with each subparcel proportionate in value to each cotenant's fractional interest or partition by sale, in

which case the property is forcibly sold in its entirety with the proceeds of the sale distributed among the cotenants, again in proportion to their relative interests in the property. In the overwhelming majority of states, statutes governing partition mandate that partition in kind is the much preferred remedy because a forced sale of a person's property has always been viewed as an extraordinary remedy which undermines fundamental property rights.

- Despite the overwhelming statutory preference for partition in kind, courts in a large number of states typically resolve partition actions by ordering partition by sale which usually results in forcing property owners off their land without their consent. This occurs even in cases in which the property could easily have been divided in kind or an overwhelming majority of the cotenants had opposed partition by sale or even in some cases when the only remedy any cotenant petitioned the court to order was partition in kind and not partition by sale.
- A de facto preference for a partition by sale in many states has arisen in part because courts often only consider the theoretical beneficial economic effect of ordering a partition by sale as opposed to a partition in kind. The many courts that utilize this approach do not place much value on upholding basic property rights and do not take account of the noneconomic value which many owners place upon their property. These noneconomic values can be substantial as families often value their family real property for its ancestral and even historical significance or its capacity to provide shelter that in some cases may prevent homelessness.
- Further, courts typically order the property sold at an auction utilizing forced sale procedures that are notorious for yielding sales prices well below market value. A sale under these forced sale conditions normally harms the tenants in common economically by depriving them of the market value of their property but gives the buyer an unjustified windfall because the buyer acquires the property at a significant discount from its market value and often for fire sale prices. The forced sale conditions under which partition sales occur virtually guarantee that wealth will not be maximized for the tenants in common even though judges frequently order partition sales because they claim that a partition sale will be wealth maximizing for the cotenants.
- To make matters worse, in many states cotenants who unsuccessfully resist a request for a court-ordered partition by sale are then required to pay a portion of the attorney's fees and costs incurred by the cotenant who petitioned the court for a partition by sale, forcing them in effect to pay for the deprivation of their property rights and their resulting loss of wealth. These fees and costs are in addition to the attorney's fees they must pay the attorney they hired in their unsuccessful effort to resist the sale and maintain ownership of their property.
- Given these rules and practices which many courts utilize in partition actions, it is often the case that an unscrupulous real estate speculator purchases a very small interest in family-owned tenancy-in-common property with the sole purpose of seeking a court-ordered partition by sale. Often such a speculator submits the winning bid in the subsequent auction sale of the property even though the winning bid represents just a fraction of the property's market value.

For these reasons, estate planners and real estate lawyers believe that tenancy-in-common ownership under the default rules represents one of the most unstable forms of real property ownership. To address the dangers of this form of ownership, these professionals routinely advise their wealthy and legally savvy clients to enter into privately negotiated tenancy-in-common agreements with their fellow cotenants or work with their other cotenants to reorganize their ownership under a different ownership structure altogether such as a limited liability company.¹ However, a substantial percentage of tenancy-in-common property owners are not able to afford the services of these professionals or are not aware of the legal benefits of hiring such professionals because they do not understand the inherent risks of owning property under the default rules of the tenancy in common.

Accordingly, this Act seeks to remedy the serious problems many of those who own family real property have faced in keeping their property and their wealth as a result of the application of the default rules governing tenancy-in-common property by providing a further set of coherent, default rules reforming the worst substantive and procedural abuses that have arisen in connection with the partition of tenancy-in-common property. Specifically, this Act imports certain core property preservation and wealth protection mechanisms already commonly used by wealthy and legally sophisticated family real property owners as well as protections legislatures and courts in other countries now afford cotenants in partition actions as a result of modern reforms, and establishes those mechanisms as the default rules for the partition of real property owned by families under a tenancy in common. On the other hand, this Act does not seek to make wholesale changes to the law of partition. For example, this Act does not apply to any real property which is the subject of a written tenancy-in-common agreement which contains a provision governing the partition of the property (all such agreements typically contain such a provision) or which is owned under any other form of ownership (*e.g.*, a joint tenancy, a limited liability company, a partnership, a limited partnership, a trust or a corporation) other than the tenancy in common.

Tenancy-In-Common Property Owners of Modest Means Are Particularly At Risk

There is a subset of tenancy-in-common property owners who are particularly vulnerable to losing their property and significant wealth as a result of court-ordered partition sales. Scholars and practitioners who have worked with poor and minority property owners have observed that a particularly high percentage of these owners tend to own their real property under the default rules governing tenancy-in-common ownership and not under a private agreement among the cotenants governing the ownership of the property. This phenomenon is explained in large part by the fact that many low to middle-income property owners transfer their real property by intestate succession instead of by will, which is consistent with studies that have documented low will-making rates among Americans of more modest economic means.

The more that property is transferred from one generation to the next by intestate succession, the more likely it is for an increasingly large number of people to acquire an interest in the property, resulting in increasingly unstable ownership given that each cotenant possesses

¹ See Thomas W. Mitchell, Stephen Malpezzi, & Richard K. Green, *Forced Sale Risk: Class, Race, and The "Double Discount,"* 37 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 589, 616 (2010).

an unfettered right to request a partition by sale of the entire property irrespective of the wishes of the other cotenants. Given the prevalence of this pattern of property transfer, real property transferred from one generation to the next and held in a tenancy in common is referred to colloquially in many communities from those in the Southeast to those in Appalachia to those in Indian Country as “heirs property” or “heirs’ property.” Families who own tenancy-in-common property within these communities refer to their family real property holdings as heirs property whether some or all of the members of these families acquired their interests by intestate succession, by will, or by gift. Consistent with the widespread usage of the term within these communities, this Act utilizes the term “heirs property” and defines it under Section 2 consistent with how many communities throughout the country understand the term; therefore, the definition of heirs property is not limited to property in which one or more cotenants acquire their interests by intestacy as usage of the term “heirs” may suggest in some technical sense.

Many if not most of these heirs property owners have little or no understanding of the legal rules governing partition of tenancy-in-common property as studies have revealed, due to the fact that many of the rules are counterintuitive. For example, many of these owners believe that their property ownership is secure because they pay property taxes, they live on the land, and they make productive use of the land. They also believe that their property may only be sold against their will if a majority or more of their cotenants agree, which gives some of these families with a large number of members with an interest in the property false confidence that their ownership is extremely secure.

These families think it is inconceivable that one cotenant with a very small ownership interest can force a sale against the wishes of all other cotenants. Unfortunately, the first time that many of these owners are informed about the actual legal rules governing partition is after a partition action has been filed, and often after critical, early court rulings have been made against them. In contrast, there have been many well-documented cases in which an outside speculator who acquired a very small interest in a parcel of heirs property that had been owned by a family for decades has been able to convince a court soon after the speculator acquired its interest to order a partition by sale of the property despite the fact that the family opposed the request for a partition by sale and despite the family’s longstanding ownership. In short, the law of partition often functions to give those cotenants who petition a court to force a sale upon their fellow cotenants an eminent domain-like power of condemnation. Unlike eminent domain, however, under a partition by sale, those who end up losing ownership of their property at the conclusion of the forced sale are not entitled to be paid fair market value compensation or any minimum level of compensation for that matter for having their property rights extinguished.

Partition Sales and Other Heirs Property Problems in Certain Select Communities

African-Americans have experienced tremendous land loss over the course of the past century. For example, although African-Americans acquired between sixteen and nineteen million acres of agricultural land between the end of the Civil War and 1920, African-Americans retain ownership of approximately just seven million acres of agricultural land today. Scholars and advocates who have analyzed patterns of landownership within the African-American community agree that partition sales of heirs property have been one of the leading causes of

involuntary land loss within the African-American community. A considerable body of legal scholarship has highlighted the fact that partition sales have been a leading cause of African-American land loss.² Many newspapers have published articles documenting the manner in which particular African-American families have lost land that had been in their families for generations after an outsider acquired a small interest from a family member and then in short order was able to convince a court to order the property sold at a partition sale. The Associated Press's 2001 award-winning series on African-American land loss, *Torn from the Land*, brought national attention to the manner in which partition sales have stripped African-American families of large amounts of land and wealth.³

As a result of this legal scholarship and media attention, several years ago the American Bar Association's Section on Real Property, Trust and Estate Law established its Property Preservation Task Force. Along with the public interest and civil rights law firms and the community development and community-based organizations that have been working on heirs property issues for decades, the A.B.A.'s task force has been working to decrease the incidence of forced sales of heirs property that has so negatively impacted African-American and other poor and minority property owners.⁴ Nevertheless, the organizations that have been working tirelessly with families who wish to maintain their heirs property holdings or at least the wealth associated with such real estate holdings will continue to face nearly insurmountable obstacles in providing meaningful assistance to significant numbers of those with heirs property problems until the default rules governing the partition of tenancy-in-common ownership are reformed to make the law of partition more just and more sensible.

Although the issue of the substantial loss of African-American land due to partition sales has received more national attention than the land loss in other communities resulting from partition sales, it is important to recognize that forced partition sales have negatively impacted other communities as well, especially other low-income and low-wealth communities. For example, Mexican-Americans lost hundreds of thousands of acres of land in New Mexico and

2 See, e.g., THE EMERGENCY LAND FUND, INC., THE IMPACT OF HEIR PROPERTY ON BLACK RURAL LAND TENURE IN THE SOUTHEASTERN REGION OF THE UNITED STATES (1980). See also Phyliss Craig-Taylor, *Through a Colored Looking Glass: A View of Judicial Partition, Family Land Loss, and Rule Setting*, 78 WASH U. L.Q. 737 (2000); Chris Kelley, *Stemming the Loss of Black Owned Farmland Through Partition Action: A Partial Solution*, 1985 ARK. L. NOTES 35; Harold A. McDougall, *Black Landowners Beware: A Proposal for Statutory Reform*, 9 N.Y.U. REV. L. & SOC. CHANGE 127 (1979-1980); Thomas W. Mitchell, *From Reconstruction to Deconstruction: Undermining Black Landownership, Political Independence, and Community Through Partition Sales of Tenancies in Common*, 95 NW. U. L. REV. 505 (2001); Faith Rivers, *Inequity in Equity: The Tragedy of Tenancy in Common for Heirs' Property Owners Facing Partition in Equity*, 17 TEMP. POL. & CIV. RTS. L. REV. 1, 58 (2007).

3 See, e.g., Todd Lewan & Dolores Barclay, *Quirk in Law Strips Blacks of Land*, TENNESSEAN, Dec. 11, 2001, at 8A.

4 To date, the Property Preservation Task Force has made available to the public some materials that can be helpful to those who want to stabilize their ownership of tenancy-in-common property. These materials include a sample tenancy-in-common agreement and a document addressing some of the ways in which limited liability companies can be used to prevent land loss. See *Section of Real Property, Trust and Estate Law: Property Preservation Task Force*, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, <http://www.abanet.org/dch/committee.cfm?com=RP018700> (last modified May 11, 2010).

other states after a significant amount of their community-owned property was improperly classified as tenancy-in-common property and was then ordered sold under partition sales in the aftermath of the Mexican-American War. In most instances, the land was sold for a price that was far below the market value of the land.⁵ This occurred in part because, like heirs property owners today, the members of the community who had rights to the land prior to the partition sales were not able to bid effectively at the partition sale auctions because they were land rich but cash poor.⁶

Property owners in other communities have been negatively impacted as well. For example, in parts of Appalachia, heirs property has been hypothesized to be correlated with, and a cause of, the persistence of poverty.⁷ Case studies suggest that heirs property owners in Appalachia are often concerned that one of their fellow cotenants might sell his or her interest to a wealthy buyer who will request a court to order the property partitioned by sale and then will purchase the property at the auction.⁸ Some American Indians also have had their family property sold against their will at partition sales.

Heirs property ownership has presented vexing problems to property owners in cities such as New Orleans. In New Orleans, many poor property owners were not able to draw upon governmental programs such as the “Road Home” program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development which were established in the wake of Hurricane Katrina to provide financial assistance to property owners who had been harmed. A significant percentage of these poor property owners owned heirs property, which created merchantable title problems which needed to be resolved before the property owners could qualify for the governmental programs. These problems typically could not be resolved without hiring attorneys whom most of these property owners could not afford in contrast to the surprisingly large number of wealthy heirs property owners who were brought to light in the aftermath of Katrina who were able to hire attorneys to resolve their title problems. As in rural areas, partition sales have also resulted in the deprivation of property rights and the loss of wealth in urban areas undergoing gentrification.

As the post-Katrina New Orleans experience demonstrates, a surprising number of property owners who are not poor or minority also experience significant problems with heirs property ownership. In Maine, for example, heirs property is commonly referred to as “heir-locked property.” Those who own such property in Maine experience many of the same

5 WILLIAM DEBUYS, ENCHANTMENT AND EXPLOITATION: THE LIFE AND HARD TIMES OF A NEW MEXICO MOUNTAIN RANGE 178, 180, 184, 190 (1985).

6 David Benavides & Ryan Golten, *Righting the Record: A Response to the GAO's 2004 Report Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: Findings and Possible Options Regarding Longstanding Land Grant Claims in New Mexico*, 48 NAT. RESOURCES J. 857, 886 (2008).

7 B. James Deaton, *Intestate Succession and Heir Property: Implications for Future Research on the Persistence of Poverty in Central Appalachia*, 41 J. OF ECON. ISSUES 927 (2007).

8 B. James Deaton, Jamie Baxter, & Carolyn S. Bratt, *Examining the Consequences and Character of "Heir Property"*, 68 ECOLOGICAL ECON. 2344, 2350 (2009).

problems that those who own heirs property elsewhere experience, including problems with unstable ownership. This has occurred in part because many properties that were not considered economically valuable in Maine fifty or sixty years ago increasingly lie in the path of development and because the ownership of many of these properties has become more fragmented with the passage of time as many interests in such property have been transferred by intestacy. Those who own heirs property in Maine also are often unable to manage their property in a rational way because some passive or uncooperative cotenants either do not contribute their share of the expenses needed to maintain ownership of the property or refuse to give their needed consent to plans that their more active fellow cotenants formulate to improve the management, stability, and utilization of the property. As is the case all across the country, many of those who own heirs property in Maine who are committed to maintaining ownership of the property within their families find themselves locked into a dysfunctional common ownership arrangement because there are no legal mechanisms to consolidate title to such property among family members who have been active and responsible owners.

Tenants in Common Often Lose Significant Wealth as a Result of Partition Sales

Those who own tenancy-in-common property under the default rules are not only at risk of losing their real property at a forced partition sale, but also are in danger of losing a significant portion of their wealth. In many states, a court will order a partition by sale under an “economics-only” test in which the court considers the hypothetical fair market value of the property in its entirety as compared to the fair market value of the subparcels that would result from a partition in kind. If the court finds that the fair market value of the property as a whole is greater than the aggregated fair market value of the subparcels, the court will order a partition by sale. Under this approach, the tenants in common theoretically should receive an economic benefit from the partition by sale.

In fact, most tenants in common are economically harmed when a court orders a partition by sale. First, the courts usually order the property sold at auctions in which the property is sold utilizing the procedures used for forced sales such as a sale under execution. These forced sales are notorious for selling property well below its fair market value which is ironic because judges often order the partition sale in the first instance because they claim that the cotenants will receive an economic benefit based upon an assumption that the sale will yield a fair market value price. When auction sales are challenged for yielding low sales prices, courts rarely overturn such sales as most courts utilize a “shock the conscience” standard to evaluate the sale. Under this standard, sales have been confirmed even though the property sold for twenty percent or less of its market value even though the court ordered a partition sale in the first instance because it indicated that a partition sale would likely provide the cotenants with an economic benefit.

Next, a number of fees and costs must first be paid to others before the remaining proceeds of a sale are distributed to the tenants in common. These fees often include costs incurred in selling the property including the fees of court-appointed commissioners or referees (often five percent or more of the sales price), surveyor fees, and attorney’s fees which usually constitute ten percent of the sales price in the many states that permit such an attorney’s fee award in a partition action. At the time a court orders a partition by sale under an economics-

only test, these fees and costs are not taken into account although they can in fact be quite substantial and undermine any hypothetical economic benefit a cotenant would receive from a partition sale.

Poorer families who own heirs property are particularly at risk of having their property sold for a low sales price at partition sales. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that these heirs property owners are not able to bid competitively at the partition sale auction because they are unable to secure any financing to make an effective bid and because they are cash poor. Banks and other lending institutions will not accept a partial interest in tenancy-in-common property as collateral to secure a loan and most of these heirs property owners cannot otherwise obtain financing because they often have few other assets to offer as collateral to secure a loan. Given that partition sales in general often attract few bidders, an auction of heirs property in which family members of limited economic means are unable to make any competitive bids is likely to yield a particularly low sales price as the winning bidder often needs only to submit a lowball bid in order to acquire the property as few if any other competitive bids are typically made in such cases.

Partition sales that result in an involuntary loss of property rights and in the loss of wealth may be very harmful, and even devastating to one or more of the cotenants and their relatives, depending on the facts of the particular case. The purpose of this Act is to ameliorate, to the extent feasible, the adverse consequences of a partition action when there are some cotenants who wish, for various reasons, to retain possession of some or all of the land, and other cotenants who would like the property to be sold. At the same time, the Act recognizes the legitimate rights of each cotenant to secure his, her, or its relative share of the current market value of the property and to seek to consolidate ownership of the property. Overall, the Act seeks to improve the law of partition with respect to cases involving family-owned tenancy-in-common property by ensuring that each cotenant in a partition action is treated in a fair and equitable manner.

UNIFORM PARTITION OF HEIRS PROPERTY ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This [act] may be cited as the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act.

Legislative Note: Consider including this Act as a part of the state's existing partition statute.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS. In this [act]:

(1) "Ascendant" means an individual who precedes another individual in lineage, in the direct line of ascent from the other individual.

(2) "Collateral" means an individual who is related to another individual under the law of intestate succession of this state but who is not the other individual's ascendant or descendant.

(3) "Descendant" means an individual who follows another individual in lineage, in the direct line of descent from the other individual.

(4) "Determination of value" means a court order determining the fair market value of heirs property under Section 6 or 10 or adopting the valuation of the property agreed to by all cotenants.

(5) "Heirs property" means real property held in tenancy in common which satisfies all of the following requirements as of the filing of a partition action:

(A) there is no agreement in a record binding all the cotenants which governs the partition of the property;

(B) one or more of the cotenants acquired title from a relative, whether living or deceased; and

(C) Any of the following applies:

(i) 20 percent or more of the interests are held by cotenants who are

relatives;

(ii) 20 percent or more of the interests are held by an individual who acquired title from a relative, whether living or deceased; or

(iii) 20 percent or more of the cotenants are relatives.

(6) “Partition by sale” means a court-ordered sale of the entire heirs property, whether by auction, sealed bids, or open-market sale conducted under Section 10.

(7) “Partition in kind” means the division of heirs property into physically distinct and separately titled parcels.

(8) “Record” means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(9) “Relative” means an ascendant, descendant, or collateral or an individual otherwise related to another individual by blood, marriage, adoption, or law of this state other than this [act].

Comment

1. Section 2(1): In common usage, an ancestor is defined as “one from whom a person lineally descended.” *Wills v. Le Munyon*, 107 A. 159, 161 (N.J. Ch. 1919). However, statutes of descent often narrow the term to “any one from whom an estate is inherited.” *Id.* Thus, use of the term ancestor could be interpreted to exclude property acquired from a living person. In contrast, ascendant encompasses anyone who precedes an individual in lineage such as an individual’s parents or grandparents, whether living or deceased. The term ascendant is used in a number of statutes encompassing many different subject matter areas. *See, e.g.*, ARK. CODE ANN. § 28-9-202 (2009); CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-755 (2010); IOWA CODE § 428A.2 (2010); FLA. STAT. § 732.403 (2009); LA. CIV. CODE ANN. art. 1301 (2009); MISS. CODE ANN. § 93-13-253; P.R. LAWS ANN. TIT. 31 § 2413 (2009); TEX. ESTATES CODE ANN. § 676 (Vernon 2009).

2. Sections 2(1)-2(3): The specific classes of people who may be considered ascendants, descendants, or collaterals shall be defined under state law.

3. Section 2(5): Heirs property is defined in this Act to include only a subset of tenancy-in-common property. At minimum, for tenancy-in-common property to be considered heirs property, title must be acquired by at least one of the cotenants in an intergenerational transfer

from a relative of that cotenant who was either that cotenant's ascendant, descendant, or collateral at the time title was transferred. Further, the Act does not apply to tenancy-in-common property in which all of the cotenants are subject to a binding agreement that governs the partition of the property, including binding agreements that run to successors and assigns. Tenancy-in-common property that is acquired by investors in part to qualify for federal like-kind exchange treatment under Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code and that is subject to an agreement governing the partition of the property is excluded from this Act. Furthermore the Act does not apply to "first generation" tenancy-in-common property established under the default rules and still owned exclusively by the original cotenants even if there is no agreement in a record among the cotenants governing the partition of the property. "First generation" tenancy-in-common property, however, may be converted into heirs property if a cotenant with an interest in such "first generation" tenancy-in-common property transfers all or a part of his or her interest to a relative provided that the other criteria for classifying property as heirs property are satisfied.

Joint tenancy property is not covered by this Act. In order for any real property that was initially owned by two or more individuals as joint tenancy property to be covered by this Act, one or more of the joint tenants must sever the joint tenancy in accordance with the requirements of state law. Once a joint tenancy is severed, this Act may apply if the property is determined to be heirs property at the time of the filing of a partition action even if two or more individuals who had formerly been joint tenants prior to severance of the joint tenancy remain joint tenants with each other after severance with respect to a particular interest in the tenancy in common. *See* 7-51 RICHARD R. POWELL, *POWELL ON REAL PROPERTY* § 51.04(1)(a) (Michael Allen Wolf ed., 2009). *See also* Carmack v. Place, 535 P.2d 197 (Co. 1975).

4. Section 2(5)(A): If tenants in common acquire their interests through a deed or a will that does not govern the manner in which the tenancy-in-common property may be partitioned, the deed or will alone shall not be construed to be an agreement in a record among all the tenants in common which governs the partition of the property within the meaning of Section 2(5)(A).

5. Section 2(8): Information that constitutes a "record" under this Act need not be recorded.

6. Section 2(9): A relative as that term is defined under this Act does not include a person who is related to another person only by affinity. The definition of relative does encompass individuals who are determined to be relatives under state law even if, for example, it has not been established that these individuals are genetically related. For example, under the Uniform Parentage Act, a man may be determined to be the father of a child even if paternity has not been established by genetic testing.

7. Section 2(9): In a partition action, a state court may apply the state's choice of law rules to determine whether two or more cotenants may be determined to be relatives. Under its choice of law analysis, the court could determine that two or more cotenants are relatives based upon application of the substantive law of another state because the law that applies under a state's choice of law rules would constitute "other law of this state" under Section (2)(9).

SECTION 3. APPLICABILITY; RELATION TO OTHER LAW.

(a) This [act] applies to partition actions filed on or after [the effective date of this [act]].

(b) In an action to partition real property under [insert reference to general partition statute] the court shall determine whether the property is heirs property. If the court determines that the property is heirs property, the property must be partitioned under this [act] unless all of the cotenants otherwise agree in a record.

(c) This [act] supplements [insert reference to general partition statute] and, if an action is governed by this [act], replaces provisions of [insert reference to general partition statute] that are inconsistent with this [act].

Comment

1. Section 3(b): A final order of a court in a partition action filed on or after the date this Act becomes effective is subject to challenge if the court failed to determine whether the real property in question is heirs property as that term is defined under this Act.

2. Section 3(b): In a partition action, after a court has determined that the property in question is heirs property, all of the cotenants may agree to partition the property utilizing an agreed upon method or procedure that is different from the procedures required by this Act provided that the agreement is contained in a record.

SECTION 4. SERVICE; NOTICE BY POSTING.

(a) This [act] does not limit or affect the method by which service of a [complaint] in a partition action may be made.

(b) If the plaintiff in a partition action seeks [an order of] notice by publication and the court determines that the property may be heirs property, the plaintiff, not later than 10 days after the court's determination, shall post [and maintain while the action is pending] a conspicuous sign on the property that is the subject of the action. The sign must state that the action has commenced and identify the name and address of the court and the common designation by

which the property is known. The court may require the plaintiff to publish on the sign the name of the plaintiff and the known defendants.

Comment

1. Section 4(b): In some instances, some states require by statute that a sign or notice be posted in a conspicuous place on real property that may be subject to a forced sale. *See, e.g.*, ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. § 42-18266 (2010) (in connection with property that is subject to foreclosure for delinquent taxes, requiring in certain circumstances the placing of a sign in a conspicuous place on the property describing the property, indicating that the property is subject to foreclosure, and giving notice about the manner in which the owner may redeem the tax lien); CAL. CIV. CODE § 2924f (West 2010) (in most nonjudicial foreclosures by power of sale, requiring that a copy of the notice of sale be posted in a conspicuous place on the real property in question and that the notice of sale contain relevant information about the power of sale foreclosure action).

SECTION 5. [COMMISSIONERS]. If the court appoints [commissioners] pursuant to [insert reference to general partition statute], each [commissioner], in addition to the requirements and disqualifications applicable to [commissioners] in [insert reference to general partition statute], must be disinterested and impartial and not a party to or a participant in the action.

Legislative Note: *Nearly every state uses the term “commissioner.” However, there are some exceptions. For example, California uses the term “referee” and Georgia uses the term “partitioner.”*

SECTION 6. DETERMINATION OF VALUE.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (b) and (c), if the court determines that the property that is the subject of a partition action is heirs property, the court shall determine the fair market value of the property by ordering an appraisal pursuant to subsection (d).

(b) If all cotenants have agreed to the value of the property or to another method of valuation, the court shall adopt that value or the value produced by the agreed method of

valuation.

(c) If the court determines that the evidentiary value of an appraisal is outweighed by the cost of the appraisal, the court, after an evidentiary hearing, shall determine the fair market value of the property and send notice to the parties of the value.

(d) If the court orders an appraisal, the court shall appoint a disinterested real estate appraiser licensed in this state to determine the fair market value of the property assuming sole ownership of the fee simple estate. On completion of the appraisal, the appraiser shall file a sworn or verified appraisal with the court.

(e) If an appraisal is conducted pursuant to subsection (d), not later than 10 days after the appraisal is filed, the court shall send notice to each party with a known address, stating:

(1) the appraised fair market value of the property;

(2) that the appraisal is available at the clerk's office; and

(3) that a party may file with the court an objection to the appraisal not later than 30 days after the notice is sent, stating the grounds for the objection.

(f) If an appraisal is filed with the court pursuant to subsection (d), the court shall conduct a hearing to determine the fair market value of the property not sooner than 30 days after a copy of the notice of the appraisal is sent to each party under subsection (e), whether or not an objection to the appraisal is filed under subsection (e)(3). In addition to the court-ordered appraisal, the court may consider any other evidence of value offered by a party.

(g) After a hearing under subsection (f), but before considering the merits of the partition action, the court shall determine the fair market value of the property and send notice to the parties of the value.

Comment

1. Section 6(a): Some states require that any property that may be subject to partition by sale shall first be appraised before a court decides whether to order partition in kind or partition by sale. *See, e.g.*, N.M. STAT. § 42-5-7 (2009). Other states require that nearly all real property that is to be sold under an order or a judgment of a court must be appraised before the property is sold. *See, e.g.*, KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § 426.520 (West 2010).

2. Section 6(b): The court may not adopt a monetary value for the property that only some of the cotenants but not others have agreed upon or a valuation derived from an alternative method of valuation that only some of the cotenants have agreed upon even if the only cotenants that have not agreed to the value of the property or to another method of valuation are cotenants that are unknown, unlocatable, or otherwise remain unascertained.

3. Section 6(b): The cotenants may agree that the property should be valued utilizing a less expensive method of valuation than an appraisal in situations, for example, in which the cotenants lack the expertise to value the property themselves. For example, the cotenants may agree to authorize two real estate brokers each to submit a broker's opinion of value and further may agree that the two valuation opinions should be averaged to determine the value of the property.

4. Section 6(d): Under certain circumstances, some states require that property that is to be sold by partition by sale be appraised by one or more disinterested persons. *See, e.g.*, MINN. STAT. § 558.17 (2009) (providing that property subject to partition by sale shall be appraised by two or more disinterested persons before the property is sold if the court orders the property sold at a private sale instead of at a public auction). In some instances, states require that certain court-appointed real estate appraisers must be state-certified and in good standing with the state appraisal authorities. *See, e.g.*, OKLA. STAT. tit. 52, § 318.5 (2009).

5. Section 6(d): State statutes and case law typically refer to one person's exclusive ownership of property as "sole ownership." *See, e.g.*, CAL. CIV. CODE § 681 (2010) (designating the ownership of property by a single person as a sole or several ownership); FLA. STAT. § 711.502 (2009) ("Only individuals whose registration of a security shows sole ownership by one individual . . . may obtain registration in beneficiary form"); MONT. CODE ANN. 70-1-305 (2009); S.D. CODIFIED LAWS § 43-2-10 (2009) ("The ownership of property by a single person is designated as a sole or several ownership."). *See also In re Robertson*, 203 F.3d 855, 860 (5th Cir. 2000) ("[T]he assets of which each former spouse acquires sole ownership is reclassified by law as the separate, exclusive property of that former spouse.").

SECTION 7. COTENANT BUYOUT.

(a) If any cotenant requested partition by sale, after the determination of value under

Section 6, the court shall send notice to the parties that any cotenant except a cotenant that

requested partition by sale may buy all the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale.

(b) Not later than 45 days after the notice is sent under subsection (a), any cotenant except a cotenant that requested partition by sale may give notice to the court that it elects to buy all the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale.

(c) The purchase price for each of the interests of a cotenant that requested partition by sale is the value of the entire parcel determined under Section 6 multiplied by the cotenant's fractional ownership of the entire parcel.

(d) After expiration of the period in subsection (b), the following rules apply:

(1) If only one cotenant elects to buy all the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale, the court shall notify all the parties of that fact.

(2) If more than one cotenant elects to buy all the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale, the court shall allocate the right to buy those interests among the electing cotenants based on each electing cotenant's existing fractional ownership of the entire parcel divided by the total existing fractional ownership of all cotenants electing to buy and send notice to all the parties of that fact and of the price to be paid by each electing cotenant.

(3) If no cotenant elects to buy all the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale, the court shall send notice to all the parties of that fact and resolve the partition action under Section 8(a) and (b).

(e) If the court sends notice to the parties under subsection (d)(1) or (2), the court shall set a date, not sooner than 60 days after the date the notice was sent, by which electing cotenants must pay their apportioned price into the court. After this date, the following rules apply:

(1) If all electing cotenants timely pay their apportioned price into court, the court

shall issue an order reallocating all the interests of the cotenants and disburse the amounts held by the court to the persons entitled to them.

(2) If no electing cotenant timely pays its apportioned price, the court shall resolve the partition action under Section 8(a) and (b) as if the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale were not purchased.

(3) If one or more but not all of the electing cotenants fail to pay their apportioned price on time, the court [, on motion,] shall give notice to the electing cotenants that paid their apportioned price of the interest remaining and the price for all that interest.

(f) Not later than 20 days after the court gives notice pursuant to subsection (e)(3), any cotenant that paid may elect to purchase all of the remaining interest by paying the entire price into the court. After the 20-day period, the following rules apply:

(1) If only one cotenant pays the entire price for the remaining interest, the court shall issue an order reallocating the remaining interest to that cotenant. The court shall issue promptly an order reallocating the interests of all of the cotenants and disburse the amounts held by it to the persons entitled to them.

(2) If no cotenant pays the entire price for the remaining interest, the court shall resolve the partition action under Section 8(a) and (b) as if the interests of the cotenants that requested partition by sale were not purchased.

(3) If more than one cotenant pays the entire price for the remaining interest, the court shall reapportion the remaining interest among those paying cotenants, based on each paying cotenant's original fractional ownership of the entire parcel divided by the total original fractional ownership of all cotenants that paid the entire price for the remaining interest. The court shall issue promptly an order reallocating all of the cotenants' interests, disburse the

amounts held by it to the persons entitled to them, and promptly refund any excess payment held by the court.

(g) Not later than 45 days after the court sends notice to the parties pursuant to subsection (a), any cotenant entitled to buy an interest under this section may request the court to authorize the sale as part of the pending action of the interests of cotenants named as defendants and served with the complaint but that did not appear in the action.

(h) If the court receives a timely request under subsection (g), the court, after hearing, may deny the request or authorize the requested additional sale on such terms as the court determines are fair and reasonable, subject to the following limitations:

(1) a sale authorized under this subsection may occur only after the purchase prices for all interests subject to sale under subsections (a) through (f) have been paid into court and those interests have been reallocated among the cotenants as provided in those subsections; and

(2) the purchase price for the interest of a nonappearing cotenant is based on the court's determination of value under Section 6.

Comment

1. This Act includes a mechanism for the buyout of interests as the first preferred alternative to partition by sale to promote judicial economy, to encourage consolidation of ownership, and to accomplish the larger goal of establishing a default, statutory approach to partition of inherited property which mirrors the best practices used for family property owned by those who are wealthy and legally savvy. Private tenancy-in-common agreements, whether for family property or commercial property, virtually always provide that a cotenant that wishes to exit ownership must first offer his or her interest for sale to other cotenants.

Conducting the interest buyout process first may achieve sufficient consolidation of interests or alignment of interests among remaining cotenants that buyout eliminates the need for either partition in kind or partition by sale, and the relatively greater associated time, costs and complexities of the two latter remedies.

2. Although this section is one of the longer sections of the Act, it is streamlined compared to most, if not all, buyout provisions in written private agreements such as limited liability company operating agreements and tenancy-in-common agreements, and compared to buyout statutes in those states which have them. This streamlined buyout mechanism is consistent with the default rule nature of the overall Act.

Most of the detail of the section arises from the need to describe the procedural steps and mathematical proportions applicable at various stages in the buyout process, and to guide courts, that may not be familiar with buyout contracts or their corporate cousins, subscription agreements, including the possible outcomes of each step in a buyout and the next judicial action to assure an orderly process completed efficiently. Again, implementation of a buyout procedure in a given case is likely to be by far the fastest and simplest remedy to implement, both in comparison with partition in kind and partition by sale. Even allowing for motion practice, the expectation is that the mandatory buyout provisions of this Act could be and typically should be completed within a maximum of four to six months after the court establishes the value of the underlying real property (which must be done in any case under the Act).

3. Only those cotenants that seek partition by sale are mandatorily subject to the buyout. A cotenant who seeks partition by sale has already determined that he or she is willing to be divested of any interest in the real property owned in common in exchange for being paid money for any such divested interest. This is not necessarily true of cotenants that seek partition in kind or cotenants that are respondents in the partition proceeding. A principal historical justification for the remedy of a forced sale in many contexts has been to allow owners no longer desiring to participate in ownership to exit. A buyout mechanism such as the one in this section accomplishes this purpose without divesting owners who affirmatively indicate their preference for continuing ownership.

4. The buyout section gives a court, upon prompt motion, the discretion to conduct or not to conduct a second buyout process for the interests of cotenants who are respondents (a.k.a. defendants) in the action but do not file an appearance. In any case the first, mandatory buyout process for cotenants seeking partition by sale must be completed (and must result in a buyout) before the second, discretionary buyout process can begin. This ensures the best chance to consolidate interests in those cotenants who wish to continue to own a parcel of property together, by limiting the amount of money the purchasing cotenants need (just enough to purchase the interests of those who wish to partition the property by sale). Because banks and other institutional lenders virtually never lend on cotenancy interests, purchasers will need to use personal savings or other family capital to fund a buyout. In many cases, however, the interests (and value of interests) of those seeking partition by sale is relatively small and, if shared among several purchasing cotenants, will be within the means of many low to middle-income cotenants.

The section allows, in subsections (g) and (h), for the potential, discretionary buyout of cotenants who fail to appear in the action. This provision is intended to foster consolidation of interests among active cotenants (which makes any division in kind that may ultimately be needed easier for a court to accomplish), and to provide a fund of money based on a court-approved appraisal of land value, rather than a divided portion of land of potentially less certain

value, for the benefit of those cotenants who cannot be located or who fail to appear and participate in the action. Courts should consider, however, that many small interest holders sometimes do not believe the court really has the power to take away their interests or sell property and that others believe that resisting any request for a partition by sale is futile notwithstanding the merits of any particular case. Other cotenants do not appear because they do not have the money to hire counsel or the persistence or capacity to read and respond to pleadings. Therefore, a court should exercise discretion in deciding when to treat non-appearance in an action as an indication of a cotenant's limited resources, true indifference, or free riding on other cotenants. Nonetheless, in the relatively common event where there are dozens or even scores of inactive or unlocatable cotenants, the discretionary buyout may be a valuable tool to consolidate ownership among active, engaged cotenants while still preserving property value for other cotenants.

Although it is always true that cotenants could buy and sell interests outside of a court proceeding, the statutory buyout provision has the benefit of (a) using an appraised, court-set valuation, and (b) outlining a clear process with short timeframes. It thus eliminates two discussion points on which negotiations among cotenants often founder. The framework of the statutory buyout provision also creates a model which cotenants can use (and to which courts can direct the attention of litigants) to structure their own, private deals to value and sell interests in land among themselves without court involvement or as a supplement to judicial process.

5. The buyout section in the Act contemplates that the price for interests available for purchase (mandatorily or with leave of court) will be the simple result of multiplying the court-determined value of the entire real property (usually appraised value, but sometimes a value agreed on by all parties) by the partial interest available for purchase (whether expressed as a fraction or as a percentage).

So, for example, if John Smith owns a 10% cotenant interest in Greenacre, which is heirs property, he brings an action for partition by sale, and the appraised value of Greenacre accepted by the court is \$100,000, then John Smith's cotenancy interest will be priced at \$10,000 for statutory buyout purposes, and each of the other cotenants will have the right to purchase a pro rata share of John Smith's cotenancy interest for a pro rata share of the \$10,000 price.

It is important to note that this likely overvalues John Smith's interest under classic concepts of valuation (because the \$10,000 price disregards the discount for Smith owning only a 10%, minority interest, and disregards the further discount typically applied by valuers to interests in tenancy in common property due to its inherently unstable characteristics). The drafters concluded, however, that the simplicity of the math and the quid pro quo of somewhat enhanced value compensated for making Smith's interest mandatorily subject to the buyout by statute once he sought partition by sale.

6. In overview, the buyout section of this Act contemplates that the court will:

- establish the value of the entire real property;

- allow cotenants other than the petitioner for sale 45 days to express interest in purchasing the interests available for purchase (so the court can then determine pro rata shares and prices for each purchaser, using a simple mathematical ratio);
- give the purchasers who timely expressed interest in buying an additional, brief period to be determined by the court (at least 60 days, but preferably not much longer, due to the fact that property values are a function of market conditions over time) in which to pay the purchase price into court;
- if there is a failure of some purchasers to pay their apportioned price on time, the court will conduct a quick, 20-day, "savings" round in which any purchaser who timely paid can buy the entire remaining interest for which purchase money was not timely paid (and if more than one purchaser "saves" the buyout by paying such entire amount, then the cost and interest in question is split pro rata among those purchasers who act to save the buyout); and
- close the buyout, by paying the purchase price to the former cotenant who has been bought out, and issuing an order stating the new cotenancy interests among the remaining cotenants.

If the buyout fails for any reason or if there is any cotenant remaining at the conclusion of the buyout that has requested partition in kind, the Act contemplates that the court will then proceed to a partition in kind or a partition by sale (with a clear preference for a partition in kind).

7. The pro rata share any given cotenant may purchase is equal to his original share in the tenancy-in-common property divided by the total share of all those cotenants that elected to buy. In addition, the price to be paid by any given purchaser is that same fraction or percentage multiplied by the total value of the interest to be purchased.

So, continuing with the example begun in paragraph 5, above, we have John Smith, a 10% cotenant of Greenacre, who has filed a petition for partition by sale. John Smith's cotenancy interest is mandatorily subject to buyout by the cotenants who did not request partition by sale. The court determines the value of Greenacre pursuant to the Act and notifies the parties that John Smith's 10% interest is available to be bought out by his cotenants (the example assumes no other cotenant has sought partition by sale).

Next, assume Betty Smith Jones who owned 25% of Greenacre, George Smith who owned 20% of Greenacre, and Harriet Long who owned 15% of Greenacre, were the only cotenants of John Smith who timely notify the court of their election to purchase John Smith's 10% interest in Greenacre. The total percentage interest in Greenacre of all potential purchasers who timely gave notice of desire to buy is thus 60%. The owners of the other 30% cotenancy interests in Greenacre either did not wish to purchase or did not timely respond to the buyout notice and so become ineligible to participate in the buyout of John Smith's 10% interest.

In this example, Betty has a right to purchase 25/60ths of John Smith's interest, George has the right to purchase 20/60ths of John Smith's interest, and Harriet has the right to purchase 15/60ths of John Smith's interest. The court would determine these percentages and notify Betty, George, and Harriet of the interests they could purchase, and the related purchase price each of

them would have to pay. Since John Smith's 10% interest in Greenacre was statutorily valued at \$10,000 in the example in paragraph 5, the price to Betty is $\$10,000 \times (25/60)$, or \$4,166.67. The price to George is $\$10,000 \times (20/60)$, or \$3,333.33. The price to Harriet is $\$10,000 \times (15/60)$, or \$2,500. Obviously minor amounts of rounding will be required in some cases, as above with George and Betty.

Now further assume that the court orders that all purchasers pay their respective purchase price into court within 90 days after the court's determination of purchasers' interests and purchase prices is docketed, and that Betty and George timely pay their respective \$4,166.67 and \$3,333.33 into court, but that Harriet fails to do so. Under the buyout section of the Act, the court will then notify Betty and George that 15/60ths (i.e., one-quarter) of John Smith's 10% interest is still available for purchase and that either Betty or George may purchase the entire such interest for \$2,500 by paying that further sum into court within 20 days (absent which the buyout will fail and the court will proceed to determine whether partition in kind is possible or whether only partition by sale is appropriate).

Assume that Betty and George each timely post another \$2,500 with the court in the "savings" round (i.e., a further total of \$5,000, in addition to the aggregate \$7,500 already posted by Betty and George in the initial round). Under these circumstances, the court will allow Betty and George each to purchase a further pro rata share (meaning pro rata as between them) of Harriet's 15/60ths portion of John Smith's 10% interest. In the case of Betty she may purchase a 25/45ths share of the portion Harriet failed timely to buy (the numerator in the fraction is Betty's original percentage interest in Greenacre and the denominator in the fraction is the total original percentage interests of the two cotenants who timely posted money in both the first buyout round and the "savings" round, Betty's original interest of 25% plus George's original 20% interest). George, similarly, may purchase a further 20/45ths share. In this case, where Betty and George each posted the entire \$2,500 needed to "save" the buyout, Betty will ultimately pay \$1,388.89 and George will ultimately pay \$1,111.11; the remaining amounts posted by each of them in the savings round will be returned to them (\$1,111.11 will be returned to Betty and \$1,388.89 will be returned to George).

The court then issues an order in which it reallocates John Smith's original 10% interest in Greenacre as follows: 5.556% to Betty (25/60ths plus $[25/45\text{ths} \times 15/60\text{ths}]$) and 4.444% to George (20/60ths plus $[20/45\text{ths} \times 15/60\text{ths}]$), pays to John Smith the \$10,000 the court received for his bought-out interest from Betty and George, and leaves the percentage interests of Harriet (who attempted to participate in the buyout but did not come up with the cash) and the other cotenants who did not participate in the buyout unchanged. To complete the example, as a result of the order the interests of the remaining cotenants (who are satisfied to remain cotenants) are: 30% various cotenants who did not participate in the buyout and whose interests are unchanged by the buyout, 15% Harriet who attempted to participate in the buyout but could not come up with the necessary money, and whose interest therefore remains unchanged by the buyout, 30.556% Betty (her original 25% plus 5.556% formerly owned by John Smith) and 24.444% George (20% plus 4.444%).

SECTION 8. PARTITION ALTERNATIVES.

(a) If all the interests of all cotenants that requested partition by sale are not purchased by other cotenants pursuant to Section 7, or if after conclusion of the buyout under Section 7, a cotenant remains that has requested partition in kind, the court shall order partition in kind unless the court, after consideration of the factors listed in Section 9, finds that partition in kind will result in [great] [manifest] prejudice to the cotenants as a group. In considering whether to order partition in kind, the court shall approve a request by two or more parties to have their individual interests aggregated.

(b) If the court does not order partition in kind under subsection (a), the court shall order partition by sale pursuant to Section 10 or, if no cotenant requested partition by sale, the court shall dismiss the action.

(c) If the court orders partition in kind pursuant to subsection (a), the court may require that one or more cotenants pay one or more other cotenants amounts so that the payments, taken together with the value of the in-kind distributions to the cotenants, will make the partition in kind just and proportionate in value to the fractional interests held.

(d) If the court orders partition in kind, the court shall allocate to the cotenants that are unknown, unlocatable, or the subject of a default [entry][judgment], if their interests were not bought out pursuant to Section 7, a part of the property representing the combined interests of these cotenants as determined by the court [and this part of the property shall remain undivided].

Legislative Note: *In the overwhelming majority of states that have a strong statutory preference for a partition in kind as opposed to a partition by sale, most state courts within these states apply a statutory “great prejudice” or “manifest prejudice” standard in deciding whether it is appropriate in a given case to order a partition by sale instead of a partition in kind. Under this Act, there is also a strong preference for a partition in kind. In Section 8(a), select either the “great prejudice” or “manifest prejudice” standard.*

Comment

1. In many states, a court may order a partition in kind of part of the property and a partition by sale of the remainder. *See, e.g.*, CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 872.830 (West 2010); NEB. REV. STAT. § 25-21,103 (2009). However, in a limited number of other states a court may only order either a partition in kind or a partition by sale of the whole property. *See, e.g.*, *Fernandes v. Rodriguez*, 761 A.2d 1283, 1289 (Conn. 2000). This Act neither prescribes nor prohibits a partition in kind of part of the heirs property and partition by sale of the remainder. For example, there may be circumstances in which cotenants receiving part of the property in kind would receive substantially less than their pro rata share of the economic value of the whole property without a cash payment from the sale of the part of the property to be sold and might wish the court to retain jurisdiction for purposes of completing the partition by sale of the remaining portion of the property (rather than employing “owelty,” discussed in the next comment). It is in circumstances such as the last-mentioned case that the court should consider exercising its equitable discretion to implement a mixed remedy and to fashion such appropriate procedures as justice may require. These procedures should draw upon the procedures and the property and wealth preservation principles of this Act, including the hierarchy of sales procedures that apply to the manner in which a partition by sale should be conducted under this Act. If a court decides to order such a mixed remedy, the court may consider whether, in such a process, there should or should not be a further right to buy out interests before ordering a partition by sale of part of the property.

2. Section 8(c): This subsection provides for the remedy of “owelty” which is an equitable remedy. *See, e.g.*, CODE OF ALA. § 35-6-24 (2010); CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 873.250 (West 2009). Courts have the equitable power to order owelty payments when it is impractical to divide an estate in a just manner but monetary payments can be ordered to adjust for any variance in the value of the parcels from the interests in the property held by the respective cotenants. *Dewrell v. Lawrence*, 58 P.3d 223, 227 (Okla. Civ. App. 2002). In recent decades, courts have tended to underutilize the remedy of owelty which has resulted in more courts ordering partition by sale in instances in which partition in kind could have been ordered with an appropriate accompanying owelty order. *See, e.g.*, Faith Rivers, *Inequity in Equity: The Tragedy of Tenancy in Common for Heirs' Property Owners Facing Partition in Equity*, 17 TEMP. POL. & CIV. RTS. L. REV. 1, 76 (2007) (noting that heirs property owners could obtain fair and equitable divisions of property if courts stopped taking the easy option by ordering partition sales and utilized tools such as owelty payments). *See also* John G. Casagrande Jr., Note, *Acquiring Property Through Partitioning Sales: Abuses and Remedies*, 27 B.C. L. REV. 755, 778 (1986). A court in a partition action involving heirs property that may be practicably divided among the cotenants in a manner that preserves the fair value of each cotenant's ownership interest may not order owelty merely because a cotenant is willing to pay for a parcel that is more valuable than the fair economic value of that cotenant's ownership interest.

3. Section 8(d): Several states have statutory provisions which permit a court to order a partition in kind and to designate a part of the property for cotenants who remain unknown or unlocatable at the conclusion of the action. *See, e.g.*, ALASKA STAT. § 09.45.290 (2010); ARK. CODE ANN. § 18-60-414 (2010); CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 873.270 (West 2010); HAW. REV. STAT.

§ 668-9 (2010); MICH. COMP. LAWS § 3.402 (2010); N.D. CENT. CODE § 32-16-12 (2010); OR. REV. STAT. § 105.245 (2010); S.D. CODIFIED LAWS § 21-45-15 (2010); UTAH CODE ANN. § 78B-6-1212 (2010); WASH. REV. CODE § 7.52.080 (2010).

SECTION 9. CONSIDERATIONS FOR PARTITION IN KIND.

- (a) In determining under Section 8(a) whether partition in kind would result in [great][manifest] prejudice to the cotenants as a group, the court shall consider the following:
- (1) whether the heirs property practicably can be divided among the cotenants;
 - (2) whether partition in kind would apportion the property in such a way that the aggregate fair market value of the parcels resulting from the division would be materially less than the value of the property if it were sold as a whole, taking into account the condition under which a court-ordered sale likely would occur;
 - (3) evidence of the collective duration of ownership or possession of the property by a cotenant and one or more predecessors in title or predecessors in possession to the cotenant who are or were relatives of the cotenant or each other;
 - (4) a cotenant's sentimental attachment to the property, including any attachment arising because the property has ancestral or other unique or special value to the cotenant;
 - (5) the lawful use being made of the property by a cotenant and the degree to which the cotenant would be harmed if the cotenant could not continue the same use of the property;
 - (6) the degree to which the cotenants have contributed their pro rata share of the property taxes, insurance, and other expenses associated with maintaining ownership of the property or have contributed to the physical improvement, maintenance, or upkeep of the property; and

(7) any other relevant factor.

(b) The court may not consider any one factor in subsection (a) to be dispositive without weighing the totality of all relevant factors and circumstances.

Comment

1. Under this section, a court in a partition action must consider the totality of the circumstances, including a number of economic and noneconomic factors, in deciding whether to order partition in kind or partition by sale. In partition cases, a number of courts have utilized such a totality of the circumstances approach in deciding whether to order partition in kind or partition by sale. *See, e.g.,* *Delfino v. Vealencis*, 436 A.2d 27, 33 (Conn. 1980) (“It is the interests of all of the tenants in common that the court must consider; and not merely the economic gain of one tenant, or a group of tenants.”); *Schnell v. Schnell*, 346 N.W.2d 713, 716 (N.D. 1984) (holding that economic and noneconomic factors, including sentimental value, should be weighed by a court in a partition action); *Eli v. Eli*, 557 N.W.2d 405, 409-411 (S.D. 1997) (citations omitted) (in adopting a totality of the circumstances test, the Supreme Court of South Dakota stated that “[o]ne’s land possesses more than mere economic utility; it ‘means the full range of the benefit the parties may be expected to derive from their ownership of their respective shares.’ Such value must be weighed for its effect upon all parties involved, not just those advocating a sale.”); *Ark Land Co. v. Harper*, 599 S.E.2d 754, 761 (W. Va. 2004) (“[I]n a partition proceeding in which a party opposes the sale of property, the economic value of the property is not the exclusive test for deciding whether to partition in kind or by sale. Evidence of longstanding ownership, coupled with sentimental or emotional interests in the property, may also be considered in deciding whether the interests of the party opposing the sale will be prejudiced by the property’s sale.”).

2. Section 9(a)(2): Under this subparagraph, among other possible considerations of the condition under which the property may be sold, the court must assess whether the cotenants would receive a greater economic benefit from a sale of the whole property due to possible economies of scale that would result from selling the whole property which could not be captured from partition in kind of the property. In conducting this assessment, a court must take into consideration the type of sales condition under which any court-ordered sale would occur as property that is sold at a forced sale – such as a sale upon execution or a foreclosure sale – typically results in property being sold at prices that are substantially below the fair market value of the property. Such a resulting discount from the fair market value of the property due to the forced sale conditions may render partition in kind to be as, or more, economically beneficial to the cotenants than partition by sale of the whole property even in instances in which economies of scale could be realized if the whole property were to be sold under fair market value conditions. *See generally*, Thomas W. Mitchell, Stephen Malpezzi, & Richard K. Green, *Forced Sale Risk: Class, Race, and The “Double Discount,”* 37 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 589 (2010).

3. Section 9(a)(3): Under this subparagraph, the court shall consider, among other considerations, longstanding possession of the property by any cotenant or certain predecessors

in possession to that cotenant. Adverse possession, for example, raises this issue. Adverse possession statutes require possession over the course of a number of years before a person may actually take title to the property. *See, e.g.*, 735 ILL. COMP. STAT. 5/13-101 (2009) (requiring twenty years of adverse possession); WIS. STAT. §§ 893.25, 893.26 (2008) (requiring twenty years or ten years if color of title). Thus, because many states allow tacking of possession, it is possible that a cotenant may have acquired possession of the property from a relative who had been in possession of the property for many years despite the fact that the statute of limitations for adverse possession had not run, thereby preventing the relative in prior possession from obtaining valid title to the property.

4. Section 9(a)(4): For many families or communities, real property ownership has important ancestral or historical meaning. *See, e.g.*, *Chuck v. Gomes*, 532 P.2d 657, 662 (Haw. 1975) (Richardson, C.J., dissenting):

“[T]here are interests other than financial expediency which I recognize as essential to our Hawaiian way of life. Foremost is the individual's right to retain ancestral land in order to perpetuate the concept of the family homestead. Such right is derived from our proud cultural heritage. . . . [W]e must not lose sight of the cultural traditions which attach fundamental importance to keeping ancestral land in a particular family line.”

See also Phylliss Craig-Taylor, *Through a Colored Looking Glass: A View of Judicial Partition, Family Land Loss, and Rule Setting*, 78 WASH U. L.Q. 737, 766-68, 772-74 (2000); Thomas W. Mitchell, *From Reconstruction to Deconstruction: Undermining Black Landownership, Political Independence, and Community Through Partition Sales of Tenancies in Common*, 95 NW. U. L. REV. 505, 523-26 (2001).

5. Section 9(a)(5): If a single cotenant is using the property in an unlawful way, for example by engaging in conduct that amounts to an ouster of one or more other cotenants, the court shall not recognize such unlawful use as a factor weighing in favor of the court's granting a request made by the cotenant in possession for a partition in kind of the property.

6. After considering the factors in this section, a court that decides to order a partition in kind may not divide the heirs property in a manner that modifies the pre-partition, fair economic value of any cotenant's ownership interest in the property unless the court issues an appropriate owelty order pursuant to Section 8(c). This proscription is consistent with the approach that courts utilize in ordering partition in kind under general partition statutes.

SECTION 10. OPEN-MARKET SALE, SEALED BIDS, OR AUCTION.

(a) If the court orders a sale of heirs property, the sale must be an open-market sale unless the court finds that a sale by sealed bids or an auction would be more economically

advantageous and in the best interest of the cotenants as a group.

(b) If the court orders an open-market sale and the parties, not later than 10 days after the entry of the order, agree on a real estate broker licensed in this state to offer the property for sale, the court shall appoint the broker and establish a reasonable commission. If the parties do not agree on a broker, the court shall appoint a disinterested real estate broker licensed in this state to offer the property for sale and shall establish a reasonable commission. The broker shall offer the property for sale in a commercially reasonable manner at a price no lower than the determination of value and on the terms and conditions established by the court.

(c) If the broker appointed under subsection (b) obtains within a reasonable time an offer to purchase the property for at least the determination of value:

- (1) the broker shall comply with the reporting requirements in Section 11; and
- (2) the sale may be completed in accordance with state law other than this [act].

(d) If the broker appointed under subsection (b) does not obtain within a reasonable time an offer to purchase the property for at least the determination of value, the court, after hearing, may:

- (1) approve the highest outstanding offer, if any;
- (2) redetermine the value of the property and order that the property continue to be offered for an additional time; or
- (3) order that the property be sold by sealed bids or at an auction.

(e) If the court orders a sale by sealed bids or an auction, the court shall set terms and conditions of the sale. If the court orders an auction, the auction must be conducted under [insert reference to general partition statute or, if there is none, insert reference to foreclosure sale].

(f) If a purchaser is entitled to a share of the proceeds of the sale, the purchaser is entitled

to a credit against the price in an amount equal to the purchaser's share of the proceeds.

SECTION 11. REPORT OF OPEN-MARKET SALE.

(a) Unless required to do so within a shorter time by [insert reference to general partition statute], a broker appointed under Section 10(b) to offer heirs property for open-market sale shall file a report with the court not later than seven days after receiving an offer to purchase the property for at least the value determined under Section 6 or 10.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) must contain the following information:

- (1) a description of the property to be sold to each buyer;
- (2) the name of each buyer;
- (3) the proposed purchase price;
- (4) the terms and conditions of the proposed sale, including the terms of any owner financing;
- (5) the amounts to be paid to lienholders;
- (6) a statement of contractual or other arrangements or conditions of the broker's commission; and
- (7) other material facts relevant to the sale.

SECTION 12. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION. In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it.

SECTION 13. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT. This [act] modifies, limits, and supersedes the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001 et seq., but does not modify, limit, or supersede Section 101(c) of that act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001(c), or authorize

electronic delivery of any of the notices described in Section 103(b) of that act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7003(b).

SECTION 14. EFFECTIVE DATE. This [act] takes effect